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Abstract

Community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) have been extensively promoted in less-developed countries as an entrepreneurship-based approach to community-based tourism (CBT) initiatives. CBTEs are designed to deliver benefits to wider communities at the grassroots level at a destination. However, these enterprises are not always successful. Marketing issues are a key reason for business failure. Local entrepreneurs of CBTEs quite often have difficulty in independently promoting their business, particularly at the infant stages of the business life cycle, and this highlights the need for stakeholder collaborations. This study investigates a collaborative marketing approach that assists stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs and guides marketing activities towards the business sustainability of CBTEs.

This study employed a constructivist paradigm to regulate the research process, the knowledge co-production approach to facilitate knowledge generation processes, and a participatory approach to frame the research design. Accordingly, the study was designed consisting of two stages. At the first stage, thirty CBTE stakeholders of three CBTEs in Vietnam (namely Triem Tay Floating Restaurant, Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery, and Minh Tho Homestay) were interviewed from November of 2015 to January of 2016. The interviews aimed to interrogate stakeholder perspectives on collaborative marketing alternatives for CBTE business sustainability and their viewpoints regarding the components of a marketing strategy for the long-term success of CBTEs. The outcomes of this stage indicated divergent perspectives regarding CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability. Following these divergent perspectives, an interactive workshop was conducted one year later, in March of 2017, at the village of Triem Tay (Vietnam). The workshop, which was facilitated by myself, attracted fifteen CBTE stakeholders, comprising eight of the original interviewees. The workshop provided a platform for CBTE stakeholders to interact and achieve a consensus on a pathway connecting CBTE marketing and business sustainability. Content analysis, narrative analysis and document analysis were used to assist the data analysis.
The findings of this study included a CBTE marketing collaboration of multiple stakeholders, a framework of collaboration that assists stakeholder interventions in marketing CBTEs, and proposed marketing strategies for CBTE business sustainability in Vietnam. The CBTE marketing collaboration of multiple stakeholders stressed the involvement of multiple stakeholders rather than dyadic relationships in marketing CBTEs for business sustainability. In this type of CBTE marketing collaboration, the linkages of a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative, and a social enterprise were centralised. The social enterprise transforming from commercially successful tour operators was involved in the CBTE marketing collaboration as a collaboration facilitator, and the government was involved as an arbitrator and controller. The CBTE collaborative marketing framework highlighted an appreciation to other viewpoints among involved stakeholders. Under the framework, a set of rules co-created by involved stakeholders, aligned with the objectives of CBTE business sustainability and aimed to regulate stakeholder interventions was advocated. Also included in the framework was the transparency of benefits delivered between local and external stakeholders and the self-control of community leaders towards collective benefits. The proposed CBTE marketing strategies exemplified the integration of third way approach in CBT development and third space approach in CBT marketing to better promote the business sustainability of CBTEs. In these strategies, selective marketing segmentation techniques were preferred; community values and market-oriented attributes were incorporated in product design; service quality control was centralised in product development; an inclusion of a community fund and the alignment to an agreed pricing framework were accounted for; a gird of marketing intermediaries was suggested; young members of a community were involved in promoting CBTEs via social media. Accordingly, the proposed strategies were able to balance the dual objectives of commercial viability and community development for CBTE business sustainability. These findings were compiled to develop a collaborative marketing approach for the long-term success of CBTEs in less-developed countries.

The results also revealed the relevance and significance of the knowledge co-production approach. This approach could help to reconcile diverse perspectives among CBTE stakeholders in a CBTE marketing network. Additionally, it could
reduce the research-practice gap in the study of CBTE collaborative marketing and leverage the societal contributions of the study.

The contributions of this study lie in five aspects. First, the study advances the CBT literature through arguing the resonance of alternative approaches to address the complex domain of CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability. Second, the study advances discussions about the linkages between marketing and sustainable tourism by applying the concept of sustainable tourism marketing in the context of CBTEs. Third, the study enriches the insights of multi-stakeholder collaborations at the organisational level through the collaborative marketing approach developed for the long-term success of CBTEs in less-developed countries. Fourth, the study contributes to debates on tourism knowledge making by advocating for the knowledge co-production approach in collaborative work with people. Finally, the study highlights the attributes of a collaborative marketing approach to overcome the marketing challenges of CBTEs in less-developed countries and bolster their long-term success.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Research background

Community-based tourism (CBT), since its introduction in the early 1980s, has been increasingly recognised as an alternative form of tourism development. CBT is argued to better promote the sustainable development of a destination through its community-oriented characteristics. CBT is potential to diversify tourism benefits to wider communities in peripheral areas, optimise the social capital of a community, empower the community, promote the community identity and community pride, and encourage community equity and development (Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2016; Harrison & Schipani, 2007; Lemelin, Koster, & Youroukos, 2015; López-Guzmán, Sánchez-Cañizares, & Pavón, 2011; Pawson, D’Arcy, & Richardson, 2017; Pereiro, 2016; Schott & Nhem, 2018). Furthermore, CBT can be a medium by which the consumerism attributes of volunteer tourism, eco-tourism, pro-poor tourism and other types of transformational tourism are fulfilled. For instance, the impact of eco-tourism on biodiversity conservation, and environmental education can both be facilitated through CBT experiences (Kiss, 2004; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Walter, 2016). Likewise, volunteering tourists travelling with the aim of making positive changes in the communities of less-developed countries tend to consume CBT offerings (Butcher & Smith, 2010; Lupoli, Morse, Bailey, & Schelhas, 2014).

Owing to these promising potentialities, CBT has affirmed its orthodox status among sustainable tourism initiatives in different parts of the world (Weaver, 2010). Particularly, the model of community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) has proliferated in the less-developed countries of Africa, Latin America and Asia to encapsulate such potentialities of CBT. A CBTE refers to a venture that is established, owned and managed by individuals or groups with a common interest within the host community, and satisfying the following criteria: community initiates offering products/services based on the community assets and resources, and community reaping the benefits of tourism activities (Lapeyre, 2010; Manyara & Jones, 2007).
However, the practical evidence of CBTEs has not reached up to their expected potentials with regards to the objectives of tourism sustainability. CBTEs, regardless of their propagated capability to reap tourism economic benefits to local communities, rarely record a resounded financial success (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Rocharungsat, 2008; Weaver, 2010). For example, three of 25 CBTEs in Zambia were evaluated as sufficiently successful (Dixey, 2008). Mielke (2012) highlighted four of 26 CBT projects in Brazil that achieved sustainable success. In a survey conducted by the Rainforest Alliance/Conservation International involving 200 CBT projects across the Americas, many showed accommodation occupancy rates of just 5% (cited in Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008). Despite strong sponsorship at its initiation, and nine years of operation, the Siecoya CBT project in Ecuador provided only $200 for the community fund (Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008). Furthermore, CBTEs, if not being well managed, can also cause as negative aspects as other traditional, top-down, corporative mass tourism. Indeed, community conflicts, cultural challenges, and disillusionment and negative attitudes towards tourism are recorded among many CBT projects in Asia (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2013); Africa (Koot, 2016); America (Taylor, 2016).

Reasons for the scarce success of CBTEs in less-developed countries have been documented within the tourism literature. At the operational level, lack of financial viability, poor management and governance (Dixey, 2008; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Rodriguez, 1999), marketing related issues (Dixey, 2008; Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Mielke, 2012; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Rodriguez, 1999) are responsible for the failure of CBTEs. At the management level, imbalanced power relations and passive dependence on external support are regarded as critical explanations (Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011).

The abovementioned challenges need to be addressed to boost CBTE long-term success. Within the scope of this research, marketing issues of CBTEs are selected for an investigation. CBTE marketing challenges are classified into two categories: poor marketing capability of local entrepreneurs and external difficulties in marketing CBTEs. Local communities lack tourism know-how, business experience and marketing skills (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Okazaki, 2008). Financial capital is another limitation affecting the tourism marketing
performance of local communities (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Ndlovu, Nyakunu, & Auala, 2011; Nyaupane, Morais, & Dowler, 2006). Furthermore, external barriers to marketing CBTEs exacerbate in marketing challenges. CBTEs initiatives in the rural and peripheral regions of less-developed countries are confronted with physical and cultural remoteness from the potential marketplace (Dixey, 2008; Forstner, 2004; Goodwin, 2006). These challenges impede CBTEs in marketing their businesses independently. Accordingly, the research focuses on addressing CBTE marketing challenges to leverage their business sustainability, thereby enhancing the possibility of CBT success in practice.

1.2. Motivation for this research

A great number of studies have evaluated the development of CBT initiatives in less-developed countries as a mixture of failure and success, and promising potentials and frustrated reality (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Weaver, 2010). There is a lack of attempts proposing an approach for the better business sustainability of CBTEs. Likewise, in contrast to excessive research evaluating the marketing challenges that hinder CBTEs from long-term success, lesser attention has been paid to tackling CBTE marketing challenges and thereby promoting their business sustainability. Such research is worthwhile. As the fundamental and ultimate recipient to CBT studies are local communities, who are constantly frustrated with unsuccessful CBT initiatives, this research can provide local entrepreneurs of CBTEs in less-developed countries with a scientific-based reference to generate better marketing decisions.

A study on CBTE marketing cannot be isolated from the idea of collaboration practices. Due to the above-mentioned inherent and external barriers impeding CBTEs from accessing potential travellers, it is inevitable that CBTEs need assistance from external stakeholders in marketing and promotion (Harrigan, Ramsey, & Ibbotson, 2012; Notzke, 2004). However, there is a lack of effort investigating the topic of CBTE collaborative marketing to guide stakeholder interventions in CBTE marketing.
Additionally, associated with the stakeholder collaboration in CBTE marketing, the question of how to promote CBTEs in less-developed countries sustainably can be assessed and consequently answered differently through different perspectives. In particular, the viewpoints of CBTE stakeholders regarding the domain of CBTE marketing and business sustainability can diverge. The diversity of perspectives inevitably affects marketing decisions produced by CBTE stakeholder collaborations (Matilainen, Suutari, Lähdesmäki, & Koski, 2018). Nevertheless, an investigation on this topic is ignored.

Moreover, because a study of CBTE collaborative marketing is derived from the ground of CBT initiatives in the societal world, empowering the voices of research participants and delivering the research back to the stakeholder community should be included in the research process. This responsibility confirms the long-term productivity and societal impacts of a CBT study and helps to shorten the research-practice gap in tourism studies (Dredge, Hales, & Jamal, 2013). Thus, a study of CBTE collaborative marketing should appreciate research participants’ viewpoints contributing to the research process. Also, it should extend the communication platforms of research beyond the academic world to practitioners and CBTE stakeholders as extensive peers. However, these considerations are still under-studied in tourism research.

These arguments provide motivations to undertake this research. The research aim and objectives are presented in the following section.

1.3. Research aim and objectives

The thesis aims to develop a CBTE collaborative marketing approach oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries. Four research objectives are identified to address this research aim:

RO1 - examine collaborative marketing alternatives for the business sustainability of CBTEs from the perspectives of CBTE stakeholders;

RO2 - through the knowledge co-production approach, reconcile the divergence of perspectives emerging from the CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives;
RO3 - consequently, identify a collaborative marketing framework for the business sustainability of CBTEs; and

RO4 - concurrently, configure a marketing strategy for the business sustainability of CBTEs.

1.4. Key themes of the study

This study is developed through the key themes of CBTE, CBTE business sustainability, stakeholder collaboration, collaboration process, sustainable tourism marketing, *third way* approach in CBT development, *third space* approach in CBT marketing, and knowledge co-production. The following subsections elaborate on these themes.

1.4.1. Community-based tourism enterprise (CBTE)

CBTE is an enterprise-based approach to CBT where the efforts in CBT planning are entrepreneurship oriented, to bring the objectives of sustainable tourism development into action. In particular, the CBTE sets business competitiveness, community benefits, and conservation outcomes within the context of a micro and small venture as fundamental criteria for an assessment (Jones, 2008). Inspired by such perspectives, the concept of CBTE should be embedded in the greater context of community-based enterprises (CBEs) (Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013), and small and medium enterprises (SMEs) (Wanhill, 2000).

CBE is defined as an “entrepreneurial initiative that enhances the quality of life and economic development of a particular region” (Welsch & Kuhns, 2002, p.3). According to Peredo and Chrisman (2006, p.315), CBE is “where community acts corporately as both entrepreneur and enterprise in pursuit of the common good”. It is shaped by three main criteria: (1) communities participate in the venture’s ownership, (2) communities are fully involved in the venture’s operation, and management, and (3) communities should be the main beneficiaries of the initiative. CBE in tourism refers to “a sustainable, community-owned and community-based tourism initiative that enhances conservation and in which the local community is fully involved throughout its development and management
and are the main beneficiaries through community development” (Manyara & Jones, 2007, p.637).

SMEs stand for those enterprises operating the business on a relatively small scale. However, there is no universal acceptance regarding certain benchmarks to categorise an SME. Instead, the definition of what constitutes an SME varies according to the region and context (Thomas, Shaw, & Page, 2011). In tourism, the distinction between tourism organisation sizes depends on the number of employees. For instance, Jones and Haven (2005) describe a tourism SME as a business that employs fewer than ten staff, whereas Roberts and Tribe (2008) define an SME as a business that employs fewer than 50 staff.

CBEs and SMEs shape a CBTE. Indeed, community ownership and community management, which formulate CBEs, are crucial attributes of a CBTE. Owing to these attributes, the benefits to the wider community can be better delivered, and the self-reliance of the business can be strengthened (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Mtapuri & Giampiccoli, 2013; Stone & Stone, 2011; Timothy, 2002). The benefits to the community include both financial and non-financial outcomes. Regarding financial benefits, the local community can take advantage of CBTEs to improve livelihood, increase income, create jobs, and provide a source of community funding (Ashley & Garland, 1994; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Torres, Skillicorn, & Nelson, 2011). Likewise, conservation outcomes, empowerment, and capacity building are among endorsed non-financial impacts of CBTEs (Lapeyre, 2011; Nelson, 2008). Furthermore, by ensuring a level of community ownership in operation and development, the CBT project would be greatly supported by the locals because it reflects the community’s values (Kibicho, 2008; Sebele, 2010; Stone & Stone, 2011). Similarly, SMEs require small capital investment. Thus, they empower local communities, enable them to have more control over tourism ventures and to monitor any undesired impacts, and promote equity of cost and benefit sharing (Kibicho, 2008; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). On the baseline of CBEs and SMEs and for the purpose of this research, a CBTE is defined as a micro and small-scale tourism venture, either in the form of a community-run business or the venture of a community household with contributions to the community, located
in a communal area in less-developed countries, in which the community acts as the entrepreneur, the manager, and the main beneficiary.

The concept of CBTEs is closely associated with the ideas of Aboriginal tourism businesses and Indigenous tourism ventures. According to Butler and Hinch (2007, p.5), Indigenous tourism refers to “tourism activity in which indigenous people are directly involved either through control and/or by having their culture serve as the essence of attraction”. Likewise, Aboriginal tourism is defined as “including special events (dances, festivals, powwows), experiential tourism (guided hikes, cultural-interpretation programs, wildlife tourism, applied activities), arts and crafts, museums, historical recreations, restaurants, and accommodations, lodges, and resorts that celebrate Aboriginal culture and are offered by or located in indigenous communities” (Lemelin Koster, & Youroukos, 2015, p. 319).

The term “CBTEs” differentiates from its relative terms (i.e., indigenous tourism businesses or aboriginal tourism ventures) in two aspects and these differences identify the conceptual terminology of the study. First, regarding spatial aspects, CBTEs has been exclusively developed in less-developed countries (see Jones, 2007; Lapeyre, 2010; Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Spenceley & Goodwin, 2007; Stone & Stone, 2011). This geographical density of the term “CBTEs” in less-developed countries contrasts with the prevalence of indigenous and aboriginal tourism business in Australia, New Zealand and North America, which are, relatively, developed regions (Higgins-Dessbiolles Trevorrow, & Sparrow, 2014; Lemelin et al., 2015). Therefore, the term “CBTEs” is employed to appropriate this study context in less-developed countries. Indeed, CBT, instead of aboriginal tourism or indigenous tourism, has prevailed in Vietnam, the destination from which the case studies for this study investigation are selected. Second, compared to indigenous tourism businesses or aboriginal tourism ventures, the concept of CBTEs can capture a relatively more indigenist and flexible meaning in its terminology. The term “community” in CBTEs conveys a relatively righteous position for business ventures and business entrepreneurs compared with “Aboriginal” and “Indigenous”, which are foreign labels that unnecessarily convey a neocolonial meaning (Lemelin & Blangy, 2009). Under the concept of CBTEs, local entrepreneurs can be minority ethnicities compared to majority ethnic people, and
tribes residing in rural, mountainous and remote areas compared to citizens living in metropolitan and relatively more civilised areas. Owing to these distinctions, the terminology of the term “CBTEs” utilised in this study is configured.

However, an indigenous tourism business can be categorised as a CBTE in certain situations. This boundary overlap occurs if an indigenous tourism business is initiated in less-developed countries and satisfies CBTE criteria. In such circumstances, CBTEs built up by communities, who are minority ethnic groups, First people in relation to a territory, and the villagers of rural and remote regions, usually confront similar marketing challenges (i.e., the business is physically and culturally remote to the marketplace, the entrepreneurs lack of tourism know-how and poor marketing capabilities)(Espeso-Moliner, Carlisle, & Pastor-Alfonso, 2016; Koot, 2016). The overarching of CBTEs to indigenous tourism businesses in situ and through the lens of marketing enables the relevance of studies on these indigenous tourism businesses in this research. The studies of Espeso-Molireno et al. (2016), Pereiro (2016) and Koot (2016) are some examples. Therefore, this study sets its literature in the realm of CBTEs, with an extension to the literature of indigenous tourism businesses when relevant. The literature extension aims to minimise the omission of relevant knowledge on the topic of CBTE collaborative marketing.

1.4.2. CBTE business sustainability

Within the context of this research, the terms “CBTE business sustainability”, and “CBTE long-term success” are used interchangeably. Theses concepts share the terminology of balancing the dual objectives of commercial viability and community development in CBT development. These dual objectives are imperative for the long-term success of CBTEs, nevertheless, are in antithesis.

Commercial viability is argued as an important criterion for CBTEs to achieve long-term business success. The commercial viability of a CBTE can be indicated through annual visitor numbers, business revenue and profits, seasons and years of operation (Lemelin et al., 2015). For any tourism business to be profitable, the awareness of market and consumer demand is a crucial element (Collins & Snel, 2008; Dixey, 2008). A CBTE can take advantages of poor alleviation and other
community development objectives to attract altruistic travellers. However, given that only a few travellers are willing to buy a CBT product due to kindhearted motives without an interest in it, the segment of philanthropists towards CBTEs is very limited, and therefore, is unable to secure a sufficient portion of the ventures in the marketplace (Briedenhann, 2011; Goodwin, 2005). Thus, CBTEs, like any other business vendors taking place in the market, need a well-prepared and market-based marketing model to attract customers. The tourism literature has sounded the failure lesson of many CBT proposals focusing on community participation, gender empowerment, capacity building, and other community development objectives without proper consideration of business viability (Häusler, 2008). Thus, it is evident that a CBTE should be commercially successful for non-economic outcomes to be optimised, and to provide more benefits for local communities.

However, in CBTE development, the pursuance of business prosperity cannot be isolated from the attainment of community well-being objectives. Negligence of community development while facilitating CBTE initiatives might result in cultural erosion, the commodification of indigenous value, colonialism by external interveners onto the community, benefit leakages, and community-inner conflicts (see Moscardo, 2008; Stone & Stone, 2011; Taylor, 2016). These issues eventually cause a decline in CBTEs’ long-term business operation. At another facet of the discussion, an appropriate consideration on community well-being objectives, in return, would help to leverage the achievement of market-oriented objectives in CBTE development. For instance, the improved managerial capacity of local entrepreneurs arguably guarantees the delivery of “authentic” tourism experience (Asker, Boronyak, Naomi, & Paddon, 2010).

Indeed, a balance in the dual goals of commercial tourism prosperity and community development engraves the business sustainability of CBTEs. Accordingly, Lemelin et al. (2015) argued the successful aboriginal tourism initiatives in Canada being achieved via both tangible and intangible indicators and encapsulating both business and community objectives. Likewise, Asker et al. (2010) and Collins and Snel (2008) affirmed the vital importance of understanding the tourism market and strengthening the community’s managerial capacities to
secure the long-term viability of a CBT venture. To that end, as per Carr, Ruhanen, and Whitford (2016), CBTEs are deemed to achieve long-term success if they balance the realisation of economic benefits for locals with cultural and environmental preservation, and fundamentally identify themselves as a tool for promoting the social, cultural and place identity of the community.

1.4.3. Sustainable tourism marketing

The conceptual development of sustainable tourism marketing is aligned with the growth of the concept of marketing. In its recent revision of marketing definition, the American Marketing Association (2013) refers to marketing as “the activity, set of institutions, and processes for creating, communicating, delivering, and exchanging offerings that have value for customers, clients, partners, and society at large”. The emphasis on society as one of the recipients of marketing efforts in the AMA definition implies the extension of marketing activities beyond customers and organisations to socio-environmental benefits. Likewise, the integration of socially responsible marketing management perspectives, such as cause-related marketing on top of traditional marketing perspectives, reflects the conceptual expansion of marketing (Kotler & Keller, 2012). Socially responsible marketing management viewpoints drive corporations to act as responsible members of the community.

In the realm of tourism, due to the increasing pressure to align tourism management activities with sustainable tourism objectives, the concept of conventional marketing is re-defined and consequently, the concept of sustainable tourism marketing emerges. Specifically, the conventional perception of marketing as an exclusively economic tool is criticised because it hinders the potential of marketing to promote sustainable behaviours (Font & McCabe, 2017). Accordingly, numerous studies have investigated the potential of marketing for regulating tourism sustainability. Hurth and Whittlesea (2017) suggest a “guide and co-create” marketing paradigm towards the delivery of sustainability. This marketing paradigm is aligned with ecological economics and is compatible with the goal of long-term wellbeing. Mitchell, Wooliscroft, and Higham (2010) argue for a sustainable marketing orientation as a new approach to corporate marketing strategy. According to Mitchell et al. (2010), this approach better addresses the
Influence of marketing stakeholders on non-economic objectives and provides corporations with a sustainable management framework. Pomering, Noble, and Johnson (2011) develop a sustainable tourism marketing model through an expanded marketing mix of ten elements oriented towards sustainable tourism. At the centre of these conceptual models is the concept of sustainable tourism marketing. Sustainable tourism marketing is "the application of marketing functions, processes and techniques to a destination, resource or offering, which serves the needs of the visitor and stakeholder community today and ensures the opportunities of future visitors and stakeholders to meet their needs in the future" (Font & McCabe, 2017, p.871).

1.4.4. Stakeholder collaboration

The concept of collaboration is defined as a process of “when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain” (Wood & Gray, 1991, p.146). The problem domain is a motivation for a process of collaboration to occur. The problem domain refers to a complex problem where the involved issues are “too extensive and too many-sided to be coped with by any single organisation”; thus, it requires an inter- or multi-organisational response (Trist, 1983, p.270). Accordingly, all efforts of collaborative partnerships focus on certain outcomes relating to the domain future (Wood & Gray, 1991). While collaborating, involved stakeholders agree, either formally or informally, on some shared rules, norms and structures, which shape the forms and longevity of a collaborative partnership (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Engaging in the collaboration process are stakeholders who are “directly influenced by the actions others take to solve the problem” (Gray, 1989, p.5). The identification and involvement of a particular stakeholder into inter- or multi-organisational collaborations is determined by whether this stakeholder possesses one, few or all following attributes. The attributes encompass power, legitimacy, and urgency (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). Additionally, to facilitate the collaboration, the presence of a facilitator is crucial. According to Gray (1989), a facilitator uses their convening power to indicate the stakeholders and then convince them to participate in the collaboration.
Within the scope of this study, CBTE marketing is regarded as a complex problem for two reasons. First, the local entrepreneurs of CBTEs are incapable of successfully overcoming marketing challenges without external support. Second, the planning and implementation of CBTE marketing activities are intertwined with the objectives of commercial viability and community development involved in CBTE sustainability. Due to the multi-dimensional nature of CBTE marketing, the philosophy of stakeholder collaboration is argued as appropriate in providing a theoretical background to tackle CBTE marketing challenges for long-term business success.

1.4.5. Collaboration process

In correlations with stakeholder collaborations, the three-staged collaboration process model, which is initially identified by Gray (1985, 1989) and developed by Jamal and Getz (1995), is employed in this research. The three stages include problem-setting, direction-setting, and implementation. The stage-based collaboration process is used to identify key collaboration-related tasks required at a particular context and how these tasks can be performed more effectively to optimise the collaboration’s outcomes and make it successful and effective (Fyall & Garrod, 2005). According to Jamal and Getz (1995), various tasks are embedded in the different stages of a collaboration process. In particular, in the problem-setting stage, a problem domain is defined. Based on this, stakeholders and convener are identified, the process of convening the stakeholders involving in the collaboration is undertaken, and stakeholder concerns are addressed. In the direction-setting stage, through the processes of consensus-building, appreciative planning, and power distributions among stakeholders, solutions, shared visions, plans, or strategies for stakeholder collaboration are identified. In the implementation stage, the means of implementing and monitoring solutions and shared visions, plans or strategies are discussed, implementation tasks are activated, the process of institutionalisation is structured, and a monitoring process is triggered.

The major focus of this study is on stages 1 and 2 of the collaboration process. At the problem-setting stage, the present study emphasises to identify the stakeholders included in CBTE collaborative marketing, their position within a CBTE marketing network, and a facilitator. Additionally, the perspectives of CBTE
stakeholders regarding pathways driving CBTE collaborative marketing to business sustainability are investigated, and the emergent incongruence among those perspectives are also identified at this stage. At the direction-setting stage, the incongruence of perspectives is addressed, and a shared understanding of a collaborative marketing approach for CBTE sustainability is achieved. The knowledge gap in the context of CBTE collaborative marketing through the lens of stakeholder collaboration is identified in Chapter 2. The process of how this theoretical framework underpins the present study is explained in details in Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis.

1.4.6. Third way approach in tourism development

The third way approach owes its origin from politics. It refers to an alternative approach to the traditional, polarised left-right stances in policymaking and planning. The concept, according to Burns (2004), is proposed by Anthony Giddens, who defines the third way as “a framework of thinking and policymaking that seeks to adapt social democracy to a world which has changed fundamentally over the past two or three decades. It is a third way in the sense that it is an attempt to transcend both old-style social democracy and neoliberalism” (Giddens, 1998, p. 26, cited in Burns, 2004).

The plausibility of the third way approach in tourism is increasingly advocated. Most notably, Burns (2004), in his conceptual research of applying the third way concept of Giddens to tourism in the context of developing countries, identifies critical attributes of the third way approach in tourism. The third way approach proposes alternative sets of arguments about tourism planning and development through understanding the contradiction and tensions between the two approaches (namely the Development First approach and the Tourism First approach) in sustainable development. The third way approach acknowledges the essence of balancing idealism and pragmatism in the practice of tourism endeavours, considering the nuanced linkages between tourism and sustainable development. Thus, under the third way approach, planners, policy-makers and stakeholders should aware of “the two sides of a coin” in any tourism interventions and acknowledge the essence of a trade-off if needed. Additionally, the approach argues for the significance of including all voices, particularly marginalised voices,
and having these voices agreed at the outset in tourism planning and development. The participation of such a full range of actors in tourism planning and development is further encouraged by the existence of social institutions in the role of a facilitator and by beneficial relationships. The third way approach, therefore, moves away from the two ends of the spectrum of neoliberalism and protectionism through proposing an alternative approach or arguing a balance within the spectrum (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Schilcher, 2007). Concomitantly, the approach proposes an alternative perspective to the two extreme tourism dogmas of either the panacea for less-developed countries or the root of all problems (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012; Weaver, 2010).

1.4.7. Third space approach in tourism marketing

The third space approach arguably has its configuration shaped through the thesis of Bhabha (1994). In his work on the politics of cultural production and emergent belonging, Bhabha argues the hybridity nature in the production, governmentality and practice of culture and ethnicity. In particular, he contests that culture is unfixed, is constantly created and renewed, cannot be palpable, and can be illustrated through its fluidity. Thus, entrenched assumptions and fixed identifications that one culture imposes on another culture do not fully gauge the (indefinite, discursive, transmitted, ambiguous and lived) practices of culture. Likewise, the reductionism drawn by the populations of dominant culture onto those of subordinate culture does not correctly subscribe for emergent populations who do not fit into any archaeological and historical classifications provided on them. Accordingly, there is a space “between fixed identifications [that] opens up the possibility of cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (Bhabha, 1994, p.5). This in-between passage is regarded as the third space. In an elaborative way, Hollinshead (1998) referred the idea of third space approach of Bhabha (1994) as “a location for spatial dialectics where populations who have previously subjugated via the polarizing “dead hand of history” (Bhabha, 1994, p.4), are now able, performatively rather than experientially, to articulate a new future-as-open-world order for themselves through their own restless energy and via their own skillful and revisionary enunciation” (Hollinshead, 1998, p.131).
Hollinshead is among the initial researchers attempting to translate the conceptual principles of the *third approach* of Bhabha (1994) to tourism and travel scenarios. Particularly, Hollinshead (1998) interprets the notions of hybridity, ambiguity, and interstitial culture of the *third space* approach of Bhabha under tourism languages. He contested the essence of referencing this approach in researching cultural practices in tourism, the representation of ethnicity in tourism interactions, and the marketing of cultural attractions. The approach also allows tourism research to redress unbalanced power relations and different perspectives involved in tourism attractions (Leeming, 2016; Van der Duim, Peters, & Wearing, 2005). Within the *third space* framework, social actors are encouraged to move away from their assumed, institutionalised, archaeological perspectives to acknowledge and appreciate the perspective of the *Others*. Concomitantly, they detach themselves from pre-identified, fixed categories of identity to fully engage in the different culture. Additionally, the *third space* approach can facilitate a harmonised agora for cultural differentiation, eliminate superior-inferior relationships and allow for changes and reconstruction of identity (Hunter, 2001; Wearing & Wearing, 2006).

In this research, the *third way* approach and the *third space* approach are integrated to theoretically frame the proposal of a collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries. The *third way* approach enables the consideration of the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability and the harmonisation of polarised CBTE marketing strategies. Simultaneously, the *third space* approach is employed to re-assess the marketing relationships between local entrepreneurs and marketing intermediaries and reconcile the paradoxes in the marketisation of CBT products. The rationale of adopting and incorporating these approaches to the thesis is presented in Chapter 2. The outcome of this integration is reflected in Chapter 6.

1.4.8. Knowledge co-production

The knowledge co-production approach is “the collaborative process of bringing a plurality of knowledge sources and types together to address a defined problem and build an integrated or systems-oriented understanding of that problem” (Armitage, Berkes, Dale, Kocho-Schellenberg, & Patton, 2011, p. 996). Under the knowledge co-production approach, knowledge is co-generated from different
sources with different viewpoints. To this end, the generated knowledge is an outcome of collaborations among knowledge co-producers occurring at an *intersphere* of various viewpoint boundaries (Berkes, 2009a). Such generated knowledge is value-based and is characterised by socially robust attributes (Nowotny, 2003; Tribe & Luburd, 2016).

In this thesis, the knowledge co-production approach is employed as a methodological approach regulating the reconciliation of perspectives in stakeholder collaboration processes and forming this study’s methodology. In the former role, the knowledge co-production approach is adopted as a mechanism through which the process of cognitive consensus building is undertaken. Under this mechanism, different perspectives are acknowledged and appreciated, and a platform for knowledge dialogues among these different perspectives is provided (Davidson-Hunt & Michael O’Flaherty, 2007; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). In the latter role, the knowledge co-production approach regulates the role of researchers and research participants as co-researchers and social learners. Both researchers and research participants equitably contribute to shape the research direction, engage in the research process stages and regulate the research outcomes (Castleden, Morgan, & Lamb, 2012). Through knowledge dialogues in knowledge co-production processes, social learning outcomes are reflected among researchers and research participants (Berkes, 2009; Dredge et al., 2013; Pohl et al., 2010).

Accordingly, the knowledge co-production approach is incorporated in this thesis as followings. The potential of the knowledge co-production approach as a methodological approach is illustrated in Chapter 3. Then, the significance of this approach to underpin collaborative work *with people* is justified in Chapters 4 and 5. Also, issues associated with the reconciliation of perspectives in collaborative works through the knowledge co-production approach are addressed in Chapter 5.

**1.5. Vietnam as the study context**

**1.5.1. CBT development in Vietnam**
Vietnam is a coastal country located in Southeast Asia. It has a diverse landscape (e.g., forests and mountains [three-quarters of the land surface]; rivers; delta areas; 3260 km of coastlines), with over 20 heritage sites recorded on the World Heritage List by UNESCO. A total of 53 ethnic groups comprise parts of the Vietnamese culture. Thus, Vietnam provides abundant resources for tourism development (Jansen-Verbeke & Go, 1995; VNAT, 2017). The combination of natural and cultural resources, underpinned by the friendly hospitality of host communities, makes Vietnam an attractive destination for different types of travellers. Indeed, Vietnam tourism has significantly contributed to the national economy, poverty reduction, improved social welfares, cultural and environmental conservations, and political stability. Over the 40 years of development since the Renovation Policy in 1986, Vietnam has emerged as an attractive destination in Southeast Asia and is currently among the fastest growing tourism markets in the world (Rogers & Harman, 2010). The Vietnam Ministry of Culture, Sports and Tourism reported that, in 2016, Vietnam hosted around 10 million international travellers and 62 million domestic tourists, with the total revenue of VND 400,000 billion (equivalent to US$ 17.7 billion), contributing to 6.8% of the total national GDP.

Among other tourist attractions, CBT activities and experiences in Vietnam have increased in their appeal to travellers. Indeed, the proliferation of CBTEs is a response to an emerging trend in demand for responsible travel in Vietnam. According to the Netherland Development Organisation SNV, 65% and 84% of tourists visiting Vietnam wish to experience local culture and heritage and local attractions respectively (SNV, 2003). Additionally, according to the report of Environmentally and Socially Responsible Tourism Capacity Program (European Union) ESRT, almost all travellers (97%) are willing to pay an extra for trips that generate more benefit for the environment and poor communities (ESRT, 2013). The report also states that the major market segments of CBT initiatives in Vietnam include free international independent travellers, group international inclusive travellers, urban travellers for a weekend break, and domestic backpackers.
CBT development in Vietnam is subject to the political economy of a communist country. Under a communist regime, the central government is empowered to significantly regulate tourism development (Michaud & Turner, 2017). Indeed, the involvement of local communities in tourism activities and the promotion of CBT as a poverty alleviation tool in Vietnam have been significantly shaped by the Vietnamese central government. Until the 2000s, the relationship between tourism and pro-poor objectives had been neglected (Truong, 2013). The negligence of tourism authorities over the potential of tourism in community development caused the participation of local communities in tourism to become nearly impossible. Since the 2000s, tourism has been identified as a spearhead industry and has been integrated into the national goal of accelerating economic development for reducing poverty in the Socio-Economic Development Strategy 2001–2010 (Truong, 2013). Accordingly, a number of policies have been generated to provide a legal environment for CBT development and the establishment of CBTEs in Vietnam. However, such a top-down policy approach in CBT development in Vietnam confronts several issues. The legislative mechanism for the development of CBTEs in Vietnam is still assessed as insufficient and ineffective (Vuong, 2014). The overlap and unintelligibility of the policy environment in Vietnam have challenged CBT projects to satisfy all legal requirements (Bennett, 2009; ESRT, 2013).

Furthermore, cumbersome administrative procedures, corruption, and the bureaucratisation of officials have characterised CBT development in Vietnam (Bennett, 2009; ESRT, 2013). For instance, according to Truong (2013), local entrepreneurs, in some cases, have to deal with “unwritten laws” based on social ties, rather than legal relationships with governmental agencies. Likewise, policies regarding the regulatory limitations of foreign investors and foreigners’ movements within the national territory have further exacerbated the fragility and feebleness of CBTEs in the tourism industry (ESRT, 2013). Thus, the power of the government combined with their ineffective performance in CBT development arguably affects CBTE development in Vietnam in general and their collaborative marketing efforts in particular.
At a different aspect of the study context, CBT development in Vietnam is also subject to the support of development agencies and non-governmental organisations (NGOs). The change in the legal environment of CBT in Vietnam facilitated the inauguration of the first CBT project in Sapa in 2001 by SNV (SNV, 2003). Accordingly, numerous donor-aided CBTE projects in the rural and mountainous regions of Vietnam have been initiated owing to the assistance of development agencies and NGOs. The most notable organisations interested in tourism-related projects in Vietnam are GIZ, SNV, UNDP, FFI, and GEF (Truong & Hall, 2013). They have made efforts to promote CBT as a tourism alternative for sustainable development. Inspired by a pro-poor approach, these projects have the common objectives of establishing a mechanism for initiating and/or better-sharing tourism benefits with the community, particularly with poor communities (Huxford, 2010). Tourism, in such initiatives, is employed to reduce poverty, create jobs for poor communities and ethnic minority groups, develop work skills, conserve indigenous culture, protect the environment, and foster equality (ESRT, 2013; Hummel, Gujadhur, & Ritsma, 2013; ILO, 2012; SNV, 2003). However, similar to other donor-aided CBT projects in other parts of the less-developed world, those CBTEs initiated in Vietnam struggle to maintain the commercial viability of their businesses in a post-sponsored period.

Recently, many self-funded CBTEs, some of which are supported by local NGOs or tour operators, have burgeoned in Vietnam. These CBTEs are characterised by a market-driven approach in business to increase income and facilitate social impacts (Nguyen, 2016). However, the business sustainability of such CBTEs is currently challenged by a lack of strategic planning and monitoring tools (Khoi, 2017).

1.5.2. CBTE marketing in the rural and mountainous regions of Vietnam: The status quo

The discussions of CBTE marketing in Vietnam are discursive and divergent. The donor-aided CBTEs receive marketing support from development agencies and NGOs. Accordingly, the discourse on marketing donor-aided CBTEs in Vietnam is sourced from the handbooks and manuals published by CBT donors and from local news. For instance, CBTE marketing activities were mentioned in the Toolkit on
Poverty Alleviation through Tourism by the International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2012), the Guidance Manual for Developing Community-Based Tourism by The Asia Foundation (TAF, 2012), the Community-Based Tourism Development in Sapa, Vietnam by SNV (SNV, 2003), and the Manual for Developing Rural Tourism in Vietnam by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA, 2013). In these documents, the central theme of marketing donor-aided CBTEs emerges. In particular, it is included in the “exiting strategy” of donors, an attempt to facilitate contractual partnerships between a CBTE and an external stakeholder. The contractual partner of CBTEs can be a tour operator, as in the case of Droong CBT village (Quang Nam province) (Ngo & Doan, 2014). Alternatively, the contractual partner can be a CBT committee led by the local authority, as in the case of Phuoc Tich CBT village (Thua Thien Hue province) (JICA, 2013). Likewise, for those CBTEs in partnership with a tour operator, their marketing is undertaken by the private partner. For instance, CBT Travel is responsible for the sales and marketing of membered CBTEs under its franchise network (UNWTO & Griffith University, 2017). Indochina Junk Cruise Line sponsors the marketing activities of Yen Duc CBT village (VNAT, 2015). With regards to non-sponsored CBTEs, their strategic marketing planning and implementation remain under-investigated.

Regarding CBTE marketing research, there is a lack of studies evaluating the abovementioned marketing strategies of CBTE in Vietnam in terms of their significance to the long-term success of CBTEs. Such a study is crucial for the planning and development of CBTEs in Vietnam, as well as for bridging the knowledge-practice gap in tourism studies, of which Vietnam tourism research is exemplary.

1.6. Thesis structure and linkages to publications

This thesis consists of eight chapters. Following this Introduction chapter is the Literature Review chapter, which investigates the current body of knowledge about CBTE marketing stakeholders and collaboration processes, CBTE marketing practice, and ideological challenges involved in CBTE collaborative marketing. Chapter 3 presents the research methodology, in which the research paradigm, research design, the selection of case studies, and the tools of data collection and analysis are employed to undertake this study. Three following chapters (Chapters
4 to 6) interpret the research findings. In particular, Chapter 4 illustrates CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives from the viewpoints of CBTE stakeholders and identifies the divergence of perspectives emerging from the CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives. Chapter 5 interrogates the potential of the knowledge co-production approach to reconciling diverse perspectives, through which a collaborative marketing framework for the business sustainability of CBTEs is identified. Chapter 6 examines proposed marketing strategies for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam as the outcome of integrating the *third way* and *third space* approaches in CBTE collaborative marketing. Next, in Chapter 7 - Discussion, the theoretical, methodological, and practical contributions of this research are discussed. Finally, Chapter 8 concludes the thesis by summarising the research findings, identifying the research limitations as well as suggesting implications for future research.

This thesis is structured in compliance with the requirements of Griffith University regarding a PhD thesis as a series of published and unpublished papers. In particular, four out of the eight chapters of the thesis are presented in the form of unformatted publication manuscripts, including Chapters 3, 4, 5, and 6. Associated with a thesis by publications is repetitions occurred in this thesis. For instance, the key themes of CBTEs, CBTE business sustainability, sustainable tourism marketing, stakeholder collaboration, collaboration process, *third way* approach, *third space* approach and knowledge co-production presenting in this chapter might be reproduced, to various extents, in publication-based chapters. And so are CBTE marketing challenges, the study context of Vietnam, and the selection of case studies.

Figure 1 illustrates the thesis’s structure, the aim and outcomes of each chapter, and the linkages of a chapter to the others.
Chapter 1: Introduction

Aim: present the research aim and identify the research objectives (RO).

Chapter outcomes:
Research aim: to develop a collaborative marketing approach oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries.

Research objectives:
RO1 - examine collaborative marketing alternatives for the sustainable development of CBTEs from the viewpoints of CBTE stakeholders;
RO2 - through the knowledge co-production approach, reconcile the divergence of perspectives emerging from the CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives;
RO3 - consequently, identify a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs; and
RO4: concurrently, configure a marketing strategy for the business sustainability of CBTEs.

Chapter 2: Marketing the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises: a knowledge review

Aim: review the current literature on the topic and identify the knowledge gaps.

Data collection: materials sourced from both academic and grey sources.

Data analysis: A narrative approach to thematic analysis.

Chapter outcomes:
The following knowledge gaps are identified:
- Linkages between the concepts of CBTE marketing and business sustainability are under-studied;
- The attributes of a CBTE marketing collaboration (i.e., stakeholder inclusion, their position in a CBTE marketing network, facilitator) remain unclear within a multi-stakeholder collaboration approach;
- There is a lack of a framework to support stakeholders of different perspectives engaging in CBTE collaborative marketing;
- An alternative approach to the paradoxes associated with CBTE collaborative marketing has not been investigated;
- A theoretical framework for the research is argued.

Chapter 3: Research methodology

Aim: justify the rationale of the knowledge co-production approach in collaborative research, through which the research methodology is illustrated.

Chapter outcomes: the research methodology is identified, consisting of:
- Research paradigm: constructivism
- An epistemic approach to knowledge generation: knowledge co-production approach
- A methodological framework for knowledge development in the research process: participatory action research
- Research design: two stages
- Data collection: interviews and a workshop
- Data analysis: content analysis, narrative analysis, thematic analysis, and document analysis.

Chapter 4: Collaborative marketing alternatives for the business sustainability of CBTEs

Aim: address RO1.

Data collection: interviews (30 informants)

Data analysis: content analysis and narrative analysis

Chapter outcomes: three CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives (detailing key stakeholders and facilitators) are identified, namely commercial-viability driven approach, community development driven approach, and balanced approach.

Chapter 5: Collaborative marketing framework for the business sustainability of CBTEs

Aim: address RO2 and RO3

Data collection: workshop (15 participants)

Data analysis: content analysis and thematic analysis

Chapter outcomes:
- A framework supporting stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs is identified;
- Knowledge co-production is argued to provide a platform to reconcile diverse perspectives.

Chapter 6: Marketing strategy for the business sustainability of CBTEs

Aim: address RO4.

Data collection: interviews (30 informants) and workshop (15 participants)

Data analysis: content analysis

Chapter outcomes: marketing strategies proposed for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam are identified.

Chapter 7: Discussion

Aim: discuss the research contributions to tourism knowledge

Chapter outcomes: the research is argued to contribute to tourism knowledge through four discussions: (1) multi-stakeholder collaboration; (2) CBT development; (3) linkages between marketing and sustainable tourism; (4) knowledge co-production approach in collaborative works with people. The research also suggests a collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam and other similar contexts.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

Aim: summarise the research and indicate implications for future research

Chapter outcomes: The components of a collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs are summarised. Limitations of the study are identified. Accordingly, implications for future research in sustainable tourism marketing, CBT development and knowledge co-production are presented.

Figure 1: Thesis structure
Chapter 2: Marketing for the business sustainability of CBTEs: a literature review

2.1. Introduction

As indicated in the previous chapter, this research aims to develop a collaborative marketing approach oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries. To that end, it is essential to investigate the research originality within the relevant body of knowledge. Accordingly, this chapter is a literature review, which interrogates the current literature relating to CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability, thereby allocating a position for this research in the field. Key questions underpinning the literature review included:

1. Who are the marketing stakeholders of CBTEs in less-developed countries and what is their potential marketing support?
2. How do stakeholders collaborate to help marketing CBTEs?
3. What is the status quo of CBTE marketing at practice in less-developed countries under the marketing support of external stakeholders?
4. How do the issues associated with CBTE collaborative marketing in less-developed countries exemplify ideological challenges in CBT development?

A narrative approach to thematic analysis was employed to analyse the materials assessed for the review. A narrative review is suitable for handling different types of discourses, including both quantitative and qualitative, and both academic-sourced and grey-sourced literature (Mays, Pope, & Popay, 2005). Given by a narrative nature in its review, this method explores and interprets stories enclosed with assessed evidence rather than their quantitative attributes. As an outcome of the narrative reviewing process, findings from the current body of knowledge are combined to generate an evidence synthesis (Popay et al., 2006). This process and outcomes can be advanced by thematic analysis techniques. As per Mays et al. (2005), thematic analysis, through the guideline of pre-identified research questions can highlight the insights from the synthesised findings.
Google Scholar, Scopus, ProQuest, and EBSCOHost databases were utilised to identify the literature to be reviewed. These databases are among the most popularised sources of literature in tourism research. The keywords of “community-based tourism”, “business/enterprise/venture” and “business sustainability/long-term success” were employed to encapsulate the relevant discourses on the topic. Apart from the keywords, the documentary searches were further filtered by the term "marketing" because marketing is the central concept of the research. In another step in the reviewing process, both academic and grey literature was subject to review. The relevant knowledge generated from these sources of literature has widely affirmed in the realm of CBT (Dodds et al., 2016; Harrison & Schipani, 2007; Hummel & van der Duim, 2012).

Four knowledge bodies were reviewed, consisting of CBTE marketing stakeholders and marketing partnerships; stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs; CBTE marketing practice in less-developed countries; and ideological challenges related to CBTE collaborative marketing. In each knowledge body, in light of the central topic of marketing CBTEs for business sustainability, knowledge gaps were identified. The identified knowledge gaps underpin the originality of this research.

This chapter is structured into seven sections. Following the Introduction Section are four sections illustrating four different bodies of knowledge on which this research focuses. They include an investigation on potential stakeholders in marketing partnerships with CBTEs; issues involved in the collaboration process of CBTE collaborative marketing; the practice of CBTE marketing in less-developed countries, and the ideological challenges entangled in CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability in less-developed countries. In these sections, current knowledge relating to the research is presented, and any knowledge gap is highlighted. Then, in the Discussion Section, theoretical frameworks for the research are argued. The Conclusion Section summarises the chapter with the critical outcomes of the review.
2.2. Potential stakeholders in marketing partnerships with CBTEs

As illustrated in Chapter 1, CBTEs, particularly in less-developed countries, encounter inherent obstacles in marketing their businesses. Thus, building marketing partnerships with external stakeholders is essential for the long-term success of CBTEs. Marketing relationships would benefit CBTEs with collaborative advantages and back up the venture’s marketing shortages (Dixey, 2008; Moscardo, 2008). Indeed, numerous studies have investigated the potential stakeholders in CBTE development, including their marketing supports. The essential stakeholders of CBTEs consist of tour operators, NGOs, community associations, social institutions, and CBTE networks (Dodds et al., 2016; Forstner, 2004; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Simpson, 2008).

Tour operators arguably play the most influential role in CBTE development and marketing. As per World Tourism Organisation, the private corporation is not only a partner of the community-based venture but also a facilitator, customer, marketing channel and advisor (WTO, 2002). Thus, having a private firm engaged in marketing a CBTE can boost the venture’s commercial viability (Snyman, 2014; van der Duim & Caalders, 2008; WTO, 2002). Owing to the imperative role of private partners to secure the success of CBTEs, a joint-venturing partnership between a CBTE and a tour operator has been extensively promoted in less-developed countries (Ashley & Jones, 2001; Salole, 2007; Snyman, 2012). This kind of partnership is particularly relevant because an increasing number of CBTE projects failed due to a lack of an effective “exiting strategy” by NGOs and development agencies in closing a sponsored period (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Salazar, 2012). In this partnership, the private partner, owing to their expertise and experience, takes charge of sales and marketing for the tourism venture of a community partner (Harrison & Schipani, 2007; Setegn, 2012). However, this kind of partnership cannot be a panacea for all CBTEs. Such a joint-venturing partnership exacerbates the community’s dependence on the private partner and consequently induces benefit leakages (Forstner, 2004; Lapeyre, 2010; Manyara & Jones, 2005). Additionally, the dissemination of tourism benefits towards the wider community rather than involved entrepreneurs is limited (Lapeyre, 2010; Snyman, 2014). Also, establishing and remaining a contractual partnership with
private entities challenges many infant CBTEs, particularly in the remote and rural areas of less-developed countries. The study of van der Duim and Caalders (2008) stated that out of 24 CBTEs striking to integrate into the supply chain of a tour operator in Costa Rica, only one venture remained market linkages with the private partner. The limited operational capacity of CBTEs to be tied with mainstream product packages and the failure of CBTEs in satisfying standardised services have hesitated tour operators to engage in joint venturing partnership with CBTEs (Nicanor, 2001). The scarcity of tour operators in committed partnerships with CBTEs is further exacerbated by a criterion for the partnered tour operators, who should “shed their predatory motives or at least channel them towards societal transformations that improve people’s well-being” (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012, p.11).

Simultaneously, the literature of CBT indicates the marketing significance of other stakeholders rather than tour operators. For instance, donors, NGOs, and development agencies can provide CBTEs with marketing support, technical assistance and capacity building training during funded periods (Forstner, 2004; Hummel & van der Duim, 2012). They have been recognised as best facilitating partnerships between CBTEs and other stakeholders (Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Zhuang, Lassoie, & Wolf, 2011). However, these organisations frequently face the challenge of entering, intervening and exiting a CBTE project in an insufficient period. According to Mielke (2012), a sufficient period for funding a CBT project should not be less than 18 to 24 months. As exampled from Bolivia, some CBT projects were developed only between just three up to 12 months (Häusler, 2008). Furthermore, the non-profit characters of NGOs inhibit the marketing support from this stakeholder. The marketing expertise exposed by NGOs in those funded CBTE projects frequently receives scepticism (Forstner, 2004; Nicanor, 2001; Simpson, 2008).

Apart from private corporations and NGOs or development agencies, the government and social institutions also contribute to the marketing outcomes of CBTEs. The government has increased their active involvements in CBTE marketing. This stakeholder creates a policy environment that regulates how CBTEs should be marketed to address the planning goals. The government also can
control the level of tourism benefits delivered to communities, booster public-private collaborations, provide information services and consultant assistance, and other features of CBTE management, which directly impact the business marketing activities (Forstner, 2004; Simpson, 2008). Likewise, social institutions, such as CBT-designated associations, CBTE alliances, and other not-for-profit organisations, potentially contribute their assistance in marketing CBTEs. For instance, a national network of CBTEs would help its members in joint marketing efforts (Tolkach & King, 2015).

In general, the current stock of knowledge about CBTE marketing in less-developed countries reveals that marketing is a management aspect that a CBTE cannot manage independently, at least in the early stages of business development. Accordingly, external support and assistance is a must. Indeed, dyadic relationships between a CBTE and a partnered stakeholder, most popularly a joint-venturing tour operator or a funding NGO and development agency, are unlikely to lead CBTEs to long-term success. Instead, a multi-stakeholder collaboration is promoted to better address the multi-dimensional nature of CBTE marketing (Manyara & Jones, 2007). However, the process of connecting multiple stakeholders in marketing CBTEs is not elucidated within the CBT literature. In particular, stakeholder position and facilitator alternatives to orient CBTE marketing networks towards the business sustainability are undiscovered.

2.3. CBTE collaborative marketing: a collaboration process

The antecedent section indicated the essence of multiple stakeholder engagements in marketing CBTEs for business sustainability. Thus, marketing CBTE is regarded as a collaborative work. Accordingly, it is essential to interrogate collaboration processes in marketing CBTEs. In particular, there are issues embedded in multiple stakeholder interventions that determine the outcomes of CBTE marketing co-efforts. This section is designed to investigate those issues related to a stakeholder collaboration process in marketing CBTEs.

Stakeholders are different in their viewpoints of the business sustainability of CBTEs. The case study of !Xaus Lodge in the Kalahari Desert (South Africa) is an
exemplar of how a project can be evaluated as either a success or a failure using different worldviews (see Koot, 2016; Tomaselli, 2017). Indeed, the incongruence among stakeholders in evaluating a CBT project is popularised (Higgins-Destebolles et al., 2014; Lenao, 2013; Taylor, 2016). The difference among different approaches of CBTE sustainability possessed by different stakeholders stems from pre-identified conceptual references. Donors, NGOs, and development agencies might evaluate the sustainability of a CBTE project through a lens of organisational objectives and motivations of engagement (Hummel et al., 2013). The government, despite expectations to be a neutral stakeholder, usually over-emphasises commercial indicators in assessing sustainable tourism development (Ruhanen, 2013). Local entrepreneurs are often motivated by short-term economic incentives while engaging in tourism businesses, which consequently affect their interpretation of business success (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Truong, Hall, & Garry, 2014). Lack of shared understanding of the business sustainability of CBTEs might hinder stakeholder engagements in CBTE collaborative marketing.

Stakeholders also differ in their perception of how a CBTE should be marketed. The different perspectives in marketing a CBTE are categorised into contraposition, where marketing activities oriented towards the objectives of commercial viability are prioritised at one end, and marketing efforts oriented towards the objectives of community development are emphasised at the other end. In particular, marketing is regarded as a management tool that can leverage the economic benefits yielded by a CBTE. To this end, market-oriented, demand-driven marketing activities are applied. For instance, CBTEs are encouraged to establish contractual partnerships or joint-venturing partnerships with tourism corporations in which the private partners can compensate the marketing shortages of community partners (Salole, 2007; Snyman, 2012; Torres et al., 2011; van der Duim & Caalders, 2008). However, these marketing approaches cast doubt on their applicability to guide CBTE long-term success. Concerns about these marketing approaches relating to cultural erosion, post-colonialism in tourism development, social and economic inequalities, and unsustainable livelihood transformation might hinder the business sustainability of CBTEs (Koot, 2016; Manyara & Jones, 2005; Taylor, 2016).
Contrastingly, CBTE marketing is also perceived as concurring with the attainment of community development objectives. This perception drives the marketing activities of a CBTE to those objectives, such as the preservation of culture and environment, the community empowerment, gender equality, the community resilience, the education of young generations, and the community capacity-building rather than mainstream tourism outcomes (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Theerapappisit, 2009). To this end, niche-marketing strategies, and supply-driven marketing approaches are dominant. Nevertheless, these marketing approaches involve certain challenges. For instance, the market appeal of CBTEs following supply-driven marketing approaches is questionable, owing to hesitations in facilitating committed partnerships with tour operators. The hesitations result from potential threats associated with the predatory motives of private partners and the colonial paternalism from conventionally privileged elites and industry experts upon submissive partners of local entrepreneurs and wider communities (Koot, 2016; Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012). Indeed, the failure stories of CBTEs in less-developed countries, because of poor market access and poor preparation of market-ready products, undoubtedly challenge this approach (Dodds et al., 2016; Mielke, 2012). Likewise, because of the prominent perception of local communities on tourism as a source of income and an immediate economic generator (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Truong et al., 2014), a niche-marketing strategy and a supply-driven marketing approach focusing on non-economic objectives might discourage local communities from engaging and supporting businesses in the long-term.

Apart from diverse perspectives on the business sustainability of CBTEs and on the marketing approaches of CBTEs, the perception of the “self” and “other” among the stakeholders of a CBTE marketing network needs to be considered. For instance, the study of Mielke (2012) stated that the local community usually perceives that they are exploited by private corporations and that they feel negative about negotiations with travel agencies and tour operators. They also perceive that they know very little about tourism and travellers; thus, the responsibility of decision-making process belongs to the government and other elites rather than themselves (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007). From a different viewpoint, tour operators, because of their confidence in business know-how, usually hold authoritarianism behaviour in relations to local communities (Nicanor, 2001; Koot, 2016). Likewise, donors,
NGOs, and development agencies usually underestimate the community's capacity, which results in one-way knowledge transfer from NGOs and donors towards local communities (Huxford, 2010). The perception of the “self” and “other” among CBTE stakeholders arguably affects the potential of knowledge collaborative benefits associated with CBTE marketing partnerships' outcomes.

To sum up, there are disparities of perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing for the business sustainability. The disparities are reflected in stakeholder perceptions regarding pathways to marketing CBTEs for business sustainability, and the openness to the viewpoints of other stakeholders. However, very little is known about how these diversified perspectives are interacted and harmonised in CBTE collaborative marketing. Indeed, a framework of collaboration is needed in which stakeholders of different standpoints can arrive at the common understanding regarding CBTE marketing for business sustainability.

2.4. CBTE marketing at practice in less-developed countries

There is a scarcity of academic research exclusively investigating the topic of CBTE marketing. This research paucity is severely contrasted to the repetition of marketing implementation in the reports of NGOs and donors and the manuals of best practice (see Armstrong, 2012; Asker et al., 2010; ESRT, 2013; ILO, 2012; JICA, 2013). Due to the disparity of knowledge on marketing CBTEs, the following review is accumulated from both academic sources and grey sources. With regards to the academic sources, the supply-sided studies illustrating the components of marketing strategies (such as market segmentation and marketing-mix elements) are focused. Regarding grey sources, trends and insights from project reports, CBTE websites (in English and Vietnamese), and mass media (in Vietnamese) are accessed.

With regards to the spatial aspect of the review, only the marketing practices of CBTEs located in less-developed countries were assessed. The scope of less-developed countries set in this study is aligned with the category of emerging and developing economies of the International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2015, April). Based on this category, and with references to the development of CBT in different
parts of the world, the marketing activities of CBTEs in African, Latin American, and Asian countries are counted in this study.

Two major markets (i.e., international and local markets) show interest in CBT products and services in less-developed countries, in which international segments usually prevail, and domestic tourism is mostly neglected (van der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Within the international market, motivations to visit CBTEs in less-developed countries among foreign travellers are diverse. An increasing number of international tourists visit developing countries for CBT products, such as cultural tourism, ecotourism, ethnic tourism, and volunteer tourism. For instance, in 2008, 68% of inbound travellers to Lao were for cultural tourism and ethnic tourism (Phommavong & Sörensson, 2012). Likewise, the demand among foreign travellers for homestay products in Thailand is growing, due to the desire to interact with Thai culture and nature for an authentic experience (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2013). Furthermore, CBTEs are appropriately integrated into tourism initiatives to stimulate tourist flows from developed regions to less-developed countries for goodwill. For instance, the study of Schéou and Southon (2013) illustrated the linkages between French tour operators and an alliance of CBTEs in South Africa, in which Europeans travel to Africa for fair-trading tourism purposes. Another example of international market segments is the travellers sourced from the networks of donors, NGOs, and international development agencies (Zapata et al., 2011). However, the insufficient knowledge and skills of local entrepreneurs, juxtaposed with the unfamiliarity of local communities to alien culture represented by foreign travellers, make CBTEs passively dependent on international tour operators in tourist-generated countries and other intermediaries to access the market (Schéou & Southon, 2013). This dependence might result in potential hazards, such as post-colonialism in CBT development, benefit leakages, and business collapse in post-funded periods (Zapata et al., 2011). For instance, Mbaiwa (2004) observed that many CBTEs offering hunting tourism in Botswana, owing to their lack of marketing knowledge and skills, were unable to promote their businesses to international markets. Thus, to advertise their products to those segments, they established joint ventures with private tourism partners, which resulted in a significant proportion of tourism benefits going to private partners instead of going to community partners. A less
appealing segment for CBTEs is local travellers. CBTEs have more advantages in hosting domestic visitors than international travellers. CBTEs can develop a direct distribution channel to those local travellers who are close to the community in physical distances, product awareness, and experience terms, and are, thereby, less dependent on intermediaries (Williams & Richter, 2002; Zapata et al., 2011). Indeed, the domestic demand for CBT experience is burgeoning. For instance, Thai people in the urban middle class are interested in CBT destinations to fulfil their nostalgia (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2013). The negligence of local markets might dismiss an alternative to sustain CBT businesses in less-developed countries. Furthermore, what is not yet clear in the current knowledge on the potential market segments of CBTEs is how CBTEs can articulate the techniques of market segmentation to optimise the market volumes from these two segments in alignment with the balance of dual objectives of CBTE sustainability.

Mainstream segments and niche segments are two major segmentation approaches differentiating CBTE marketing strategies. Some CBTEs are marketed to the niche market, the travellers of which are most likely wealthy, highly educated, and intrinsically interested in indigenous values and community benefits (Notzke, 2004). They can be consumers in developed countries accessed through fair-trading networks (Evans & Cleverdon, 2000) or volunteer travellers from the home countries of NGOs, and development agencies (Zapata et al., 2011). However, the limited size of the niche market challenges the practicability of the approach (Notzke, 2004). In contrast, there are efforts to integrate CBT products and services into mainstream products through the linkages between CBTEs and tour operators (Salole, 2007; Torres et al., 2011). However, these efforts confront the issue of product quality. Van der Duim and Caalders (2008) illustrate the service quality gap, with local partners failing to meet the requirements of industry partners. Additionally, the issues of commoditised authenticity and conflicts within community members and between the community and private partners are associated with this approach (Häusler, 2009; Koot, 2016).

To appeal to potential travellers, accommodation, in particular, homestays, become the key product offered by CBTEs in less-developed countries. Homestays are characterised by not just selling a bedding accommodation but interaction
between a host and guests, in which the guests will share a residence, meals, daily lives, cultural performances and traditional activities with the host and surrounding villagers (Jamal, Othman, & Muhammad, 2011). Homestay is among the destination attractions that appeal to tourists by the indigeneity richness (Acharya & Halpenny, 2013). CBTE marketing practices reveal that homestays can be developed separately or in bundles with other CBT products and services, such as handicraft production, gastronomy and tour guiding (Mielke, 2012). However, the dominance of homestays in the product development of CBTEs in less-developed countries is not without challenges. In particular, the over-emphasis on tourism incentives generated from running community-based homestays in less-developed countries might be fraught with potential hazards to community well-being. For instance, the evaluation of homestay development in the village of Mae Kampong, a successful CBT village in Thailand, portrayed the paradoxes in commercially promoting homestays to the tourism industry (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2013). According to Kontogeorgopoulos et al. (2013), the commercial success of homestays in Thailand benefits the community with improved quality of life and active community participation, but also induces the erosion of cultural authenticity, failure of economic diversification, and community inequalities. In addition, host-guest encounters, as centralised in homestay experience, are also the platforms for debates over the commodification of culture. As part of the debate's outcomes are often the antitheses of authenticity versus inauthenticity and modern versus primitive (Taylor, 2014; van der Duim, Peters, & Wearing, 2005)

Another issue in CBTE product development is related to service quality control. According to Jamal et al. (2011), the service quality control intertwines with pricing value to determine the perceived value of travellers regarding CBT experience. Additionally, the quality and attractiveness of CBT products and the reliability of their pricing impact on the inclusion of a CBTE into tourism supply chains (van der Duim & Caalders, 2008). However, the issue of service quality control is not successfully addressed among CBTEs in less-developed countries. Indeed, the service quality control of CBTEs exacerbates the gap between the performance of CBTEs and the expectations of the travel industry. For instance, the study of Ogucha, Riungu, Kiama, and Mukolwe (2015), regarding homestay
facilities in Kenya, indicated that 70% of visiting travellers were not satisfied with the service quality of the homestays. The result from a pilot project in Costa Rica stated that only one out of 24 CBTEs in Costa Rica remained in the tourism chain of Dutch tour operators and local travel agents (van der Duim & Caalders, 2008).

Communication has been centralised in the marketing activities of CBTEs in less-developed countries. It is apparent that without communication tools, it is impossible for the CBTEs to carry out any business work. Accordingly, in Brazil, CBTEs employed local community members (19/26 projects investigated) and websites (10/26 projects) for external promotion (Mielke, 2012). However, the effectiveness and sustainability of communication tools in many reported CBTEs were very low. In Cambodia, among the 50 CBT destinations investigated, only a few initiatives published their websites with the support of NGOs (Sok, 2013). Nevertheless, the website information was not updated, and there was no booking option for pushing direct sales. In research performed by Jones (2008), 62% of 138 CBTEs in Latin America had either discontinued email services or non-functioning telephone contacts. Likewise, the Lekhubu Island project, investigated by Lenao (2013), was purposively promoted via brochures, website, road-side signs and word of mouth. However, except for the relatively extensive distribution of brochures, other marketing tools used for this project were ineffective. For example, the project website was nonfunctioning, and signboards were rare and inappropriately located. This review reveals CBTEs themselves play a passive role in promoting their businesses to tourism partners in supply chains and travellers at the marketplace.

As a summary, there are polarities in the marketing practices of CBTEs in less-developed countries. It is concluded from the marketing practices of CBTEs in less-developed countries that marketing has been conventionally employed as an economic tool in the literature of CBT. Such a conventional perception arguably causes dilemmas in CBTE marketing strategies. For instance, pro-marketing efforts focusing on marketing CBTEs as a mainstream tourism product, confront with tourism hazards such as cultural erosion and commodification, benefit leakage and community inequalities. In contrast, because of the economic nature, marketing tools are perceived to impede the attainment of non-economic objectives in the
development of CBTEs. However, those least-marketing attempts striking to remain the community resilience and the community equity at priority in marketing CBTEs frequently struggle to keep the operation alive in the long-term. As a result, marketing strategies of CBTEs, framed by either of such conventional conceptualisations, are reviewed as ineffective to particularise the business sustainability of CBTEs. Thus, in attempts to connect CBTE strategic marketing and the objectives of CBTE sustainability, the concept of marketing CBTEs needs to be re-assessed. To that end, adopting an alternative viewpoint on the concept of marketing CBTEs will help to leverage the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries.

2.5. CBTE collaborative marketing in less-developed countries and ideological challenges

The review on the status quo regarding the practices of CBTE marketing in less-developed countries indicates that the dilemmas involved in marketing CBTEs for business sustainability adhere to the broader debate of paradoxes prevailing in CBT development and marketing. This subsection discusses the antithesis of neoliberalism versus protectionism in the development of CBTEs and the post-colonialism versus decolonialism in marketing relationships among CBTE stakeholders. Simultaneously, it illustrates how these paradoxes divaricate CBTE marketing endeavours.

2.5.1. Neoliberalism versus protectionism ideologies in CBTE marketing in less-developed countries

Within the tourism context, neoliberalism promotes tourism as a revenue source. Neoliberalism emphasises the significance of individualised economies, market liberalisation, and laissez-faire economic strategies incorporated by the minimal interventions of the government in trading processes (Öniş & Şenses, 2005; Scheyvens, 2007). Advocates for neoliberalism contest that “trickle-down effects” can help to disseminate economic wealth to the wider community, which consequently leads to economic growth at a macro level (Tolkach, 2013). A neoliberal approach is argued to optimise the potentials of tourism as an industry
and an incredible source of revenue generation. Accordingly, international tourism, foreign investors, multi-national tourism corporations, the privatisation of tourism properties and mass tourism are encouraged to proliferate under a neoliberal approach (Scheyvens, 2007). This orthodoxy has been suggested by many international organisations, such as World Bank and International Monetary Fund, to drive tourism development in less-developed countries to overcome their financial difficulties, thereby fostering national economies (Schilcher, 2007).

Co-existing but at the other end of the antithesis, is the approach of protectionism. Protectionism, to different extents, looks at tourism as a social force (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). Indeed, the non-economic potential of tourism is achievable in concurrent with the attainment of economic benefits. However, these two tourism roles can be dichotomised in those cases where orientation towards the revenue generation goals of tourism is at the expense of failure in addressing developmental tasks of tourism and vice versa. In tourism research agenda, numerous endeavours have been conducted to minimise potential risks associated with tourism initiatives on marginalised actors within the tourism community (see Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Scheyvens, 2007; Scheyvens & Momsen, 2008). The marginalised actors encompass local entrepreneurs and wider communities in relationships with other destination stakeholders. They also refer to the poor in relationships with other community members within a destination. In a broader context, marginalised actors also comprise socio-cultural and environmental conservation objectives in relationships with economic incentives, and less-developed, tourist-hosting countries in relationships with developed, tourist-generating countries. However, the small-scaled and locally based capacity of development-driven attempts inhibits the protectionist ideology from earning a significant proportion in tourism industry growth and thereby restraining the extension of tourism benefits beyond its industrial scope (Burns, 2004; Scheyvens, 2007), which is otherwise achievable by a neoliberal approach.

Among tourism forms being allocated on the nexus of neoliberalism and protectionism, CBT is widely acknowledged as an alternative form of tourism, which is in favour of community benefits, environmental protection, and sustainable development (Burns, 2004; Scheyvens, 2007). Therefore, CBT
initiatives are tentatively allocated close to protectionism ends in the evolutions of tourism. However, within the realm of CBT, the contradiction between neoliberalism and protectionism also exists. For instance, in the current knowledge wealth of CBTE marketing, as summarised in previous sections, commercial viability-driven approaches, demand-oriented marketing techniques, mainstream market segmentation techniques, and contractual partnerships with private partners are arguably overarched by a neoliberal approach. Under the neoliberal era, CBTEs are encouraged to prioritise commercial viability and economic appeal in their development. This ideology is further reinforced by the fact that numerous CBTE projects in less-developed countries could not attain their development objectives because of financial failures (Dodds et al., 2016; Häusler, 2008; Mielke, 2012). Contrastingly, community-driven approaches, supply-based marketing initiatives and niche-market segmentation in CBTE development gravitate towards a protectionist approach.

Thus, the dilemma in marketing CBTEs for business sustainability is embedded in the dichotomy of neoliberalism and protectionism. Indeed, the potential capacity of neoliberalism to deliver benefits for all involved in economic transactions is principally agreed by both neoliberal advocates and developmental supporters (Schilcher, 2007; Sheppard & Leitner, 2010). The issue that protectionists consider is that promotions under the neo-liberal approach, without interference to market forces, might trigger hazards being camouflaged by a free-market economy and free trading. Hall (2007) doubted that the concept of liberalisation might focus on those areas that a liberal economy is the price of demoralised development objectives and exacerbated social issues rather than generating gains for less-developed countries. Likewise, Schilcher (2007) argued that freely neoliberalism-based interventions in pro-poor tourism might result in poverty reduction at a glance, but indeed aggravating the severity and depth of poverty. Particularly in the cases of CBTEs in less-developed countries, local communities frequently participate in tourism businesses (such as investing and running CBTEs) by economic motivations (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Truong et al., 2014). They are not sufficiently equipped with business knowledge and skills and marketing know-how (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Mbaiwa, 2004; Ndlovu et al., 2011; Okazaki, 2008). To this end, local communities become the most vulnerable recipients to the
threats associated with an interference-free neoliberal approach. The study of Koot (2016) on South African Kalahari provided an example of the undesirable effects of a neo-liberal approach in the context of CBT in less-developed countries. His study indicated that tourism revenue, through the “trickle-down effects” of neoliberalism, hardly reached the Bushmen who are exploited as an indigenous brand to generate such revenue. Additionally, Koot (2016) stated that assumed education benefits through “trickle-down effects” were also unaddressable. Instead, paternalism prevailed, in which Bushmen were regarded as needing to be educated by white managers, who lacked the proper understanding of tourism development and working with indigenous people.

Neither extreme neoliberalism nor utmost protectionism can underpin CBTE marketing endeavours to business sustainability. It is evident that an interference-free neoliberal approach can cause CBTEs to collapse in the long-term. Meanwhile, a solely protection-driven approach is inappropriate to drive CBTE strategic marketing, which embraces economic activities. However, an alternative pathway reconciling these two-ended approaches is under-explored. In particular, it is still not known that at which station on the continuum of neoliberalism and protectionism and by which mechanism, CBTE marketing endeavours for long-term success should be driven.

2.5.2. Post-colonialism versus decolonialism approaches in multi-stakeholder relationships

The topic of CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability is also subject to discussions about post-colonialism versus decolonialism. At the first stance, post-colonialism and decolonialism refer to alternative approaches to addressing power relations in multi-actor relationships. Thus, outcomes from a discussion on these approaches help to form a terminology underpinning stakeholder collaborations in CBTE marketing.

Post-colonialism refers to relations between the colonised and coloniser, re-emerging in those situations in which independent countries suffer from the interventions and control of external states (Hall & Tucker, 2004). In tourism, tourist flows mainly moving to ex-colonised destinations at a global level, the
sensitiveness of tourism to globalisation, and tourism economic transactions across trans-national borders increase the entanglement of tourism in post-colonial debates (Fisher, 2004; Hollinshead, 2004; Tolkach & King, 2015). In particular, less-developed countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia have been centralised in the discussions of post-colonialism in tourism owing to the dominance of external sources in tourism economics (e.g., tourists, financial sources) (Akama, 2004; Britton, 1982; Eshun & Tagoe-Darko, 2015). Located in such broader contexts, CBTEs can be a mechanism for post-colonialism through foreign resource control and heavy reliance on donor funding (Dixey, 2008; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Wearing & McDonald, 2002). At a different level, local entrepreneurs can be trapped in colonial paternalism relations with external stakeholders in the forms of collaborations, networks, and partnerships (Tolkach & King, 2015). Accordingly, local communities frequently hold a suppressive position compared to external stakeholders.

Post-colonialism is closely accompanied by top-down development models in CBT development. In the evolution of CBT development, a top-down approach is often employed by external organisations such as international NGOs, governments and elites. Such an approach has been widely criticised as being rhetoric towards the sustainable tourism development, encouraging neo-colonialism, and causing community resentment (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). A study of Zapata et al. (2011) to evaluate the success of CBT projects in Nicaragua found that those CBTEs being created and fully funded by external organisations, such as foreign NGOs, experienced stagnated growth or even collapse in their life cycle.

Contrastingly, attempts at decolonialism to balance power relations between local stakeholders (i.e., local entrepreneurs, CBTE networks) and external actors (i.e., tour operators, tourists) is frequently included in bottom-up models (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). Increasingly, researchers have advocated for a bottom-up approach in CBT development (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Reggers, Grabowski, Wearing, Chatterton, & Schweinsberg, 2016; Scheyvens, 2002; Tolkach, 2013; Tosun, 2006). For instance, Sakata and Prideaux (2013) argued for a bottom-up CBT initiative (i.e., introduced by a community member, minimal external...
assistance and for the consultative purpose only, and driven by non-economic visions). This initiative, according to Sakata and Prideaux (2013), generated community well-being, economic benefit, no adverse cultural impacts and positive conservation outcomes. Thus, endeavours oriented towards a de-colonial approach and driven by a bottom-up model aim to empower local communities to actively and spontaneously participate in tourism decision-making processes, encourage equity in tourism benefit sharing, minimise external supports and trigger social changes (Manyara & Jones, 2007; Tosun, 1999; Zapata et al., 2011). Nevertheless, accesses to market and distribution channels are among the marketing-related drawbacks of this approach (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013).

Therefore, stakeholder interventions in CBT initiatives, to attain the objectives of CBT sustainable development, should be driven by a bottom-up approach in orientation towards decolonialism. However, sweeping away post-colonialism to move closer to decolonialism is subject to different domains on which these ideologies are applied. Specifically, CBTE marketing for business sustainability is an easily colonised domain in two aspects. The vulnerability of CBTE marketing to neocolonialism is due to the inherent business incapability of local stakeholders versus the expertise, and business skills required for this task (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Okazaki, 2008). Additionally, the product offerings of CBTEs, regardless of their underpinned approaches, cannot be isolated from the influence of tourists, supply chains, foreign tour operators, and other travel intermediaries (Tolkach & King, 2015; van der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Bottom-up CBT initiatives, while prioritising community empowerment and non-economic objectives, admit the necessary marketing assistance from external stakeholders, such as tour operators and philanthropists (Reggers et al., 2016; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). To this end, the question of to what extent stakeholder collaborations in CBTE marketing for business sustainability can adopt decolonialism needs to be answered.

2.6. Discussion

It is argued through the literature review that the concept of CBTE marketing needs an alternative approach rather than being viewed as an economic tool. To
this end, this research argues the applicability of the concept of sustainable tourism marketing to conceptualise an investigation on the topic of CBTE marketing for business sustainability. Indeed, the concept of sustainable tourism marketing has been used to reconcile dual objectives included in the paradoxical tourism problems of sustainable development. In national parks and protected areas, a sustainable tourism marketing approach attempts to balance visitors’ needs and the environment (Donohoe, 2012; Mitchell et al., 2013; Sharpley & Pearce, 2007; Wearing, Schweinsberg, & Tower, 2016). Likewise, reconciliation of socio-economic objectives (e.g., visitors, growth, revenue, and stakeholder engagement) and environmental objectives (e.g., protection, restriction, and isolation) in marketing heritage sites can be achieved with a sustainable tourism marketing perspective (Chhabra, 2009; Gilmore, Carson, & Ascenção, 2007). Due to its capacity to address the paradoxical problems of sustainable tourism, sustainable tourism marketing is employed in this study to facilitate a balance of financial viability and community wellbeing intrinsically included in CBTE long-term success.

It is also concluded from the literature review that CBTE marketing cannot be isolated from stakeholder collaborations. To this end, the concept of CBTE collaborative marketing is subject to the investigations under this study. Indeed, stakeholder collaborations have received extensive attention in the tourism literature. Multi-stakeholder collaborations have notably resonated in emphasising problem domains at the destination level and addressing planning objectives (Arnaboldi & Spiller, 2011; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Wang & Xiang, 2007). However, the applications of a multi-stakeholder collaboration approach are less evident at the organisational level and for a management task such as CBTE marketing.

Meanwhile, in the realm of CBT, CBT researchers are interested in identifying the configurations of stakeholder collaborations. For instance, Jamal and Stronza (2009) used this approach to identify stakeholders and collaboration structures and implementation for a community-based ecotourism project. Likewise, Tolkach (2013) employed the approach to developing a CBT network in Timo-Lester, a resource-based island nation. In this study, the inclusion of stakeholder collaboration is configured through the common goal of marketing CBTEs to
achieve business long-term success. In particular, the present research emphasises to interrogate key stakeholders in CBTE marketing networks and identifies a facilitator who can connect these stakeholders and drive their partnerships towards the business sustainability of CBTEs.

Additionally, substantive studies focus on interrogating the linkages between stakeholders and collaboration processes in CBT planning and development. For instance, Reed (1997) investigated power relations among stakeholder groups in CBT planning. More recently, stakeholder collaborations in the realm of CBT are linked to those discussions on knowledge dialogues incorporating indigenous voices and scientific, external viewpoints (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016), knowledge dynamics and learning among different knowledge communities (Matilainen et al., 2018). However, it is still under-studied in the CBT literature that how stakeholders of different perspectives, whose relationships are linked to different paradoxes, can collaborate to generate marketing outcomes oriented towards CBTE long-term success.

At a different aspect of the review, decolonisation of knowledge making has proven its significance to empower different sources of knowledge and viewpoints for collaborative advantages. Chambers & Buzinde (2015) argued for the relevance of epistemological decolonisation to empower different knowledge holders, thereby advancing the tourism knowledge system. Espeso-Molinero et al. (2016) employed this epistemological tool to facilitate knowledge dialogues between Indigenous people and researchers of a CBT project on tourism product design in Mexico. The potential of the decolonisation of knowledge making to connect stakeholders of different cosmologies and viewpoints indicates its plausibility to this thesis. In particular, this research argues for the significance of the knowledge co-production approach as a mechanism to reconcile different perspectives for cognitive consensus building among CBTE marketing stakeholders.

In addition, the third way approach in CBT development, incorporated with the third space approach in CBT marketing arguably has potentials to tackle the paradoxes involved in CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability. The paradoxes involved in the realm of CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability, as identified through the literature review, consist of the antitheses
of neoliberalism versus protectionism and post-colonialism versus decolonialism, and the dilemmas of authenticity versus inauthenticity and modern versus primitive. Indeed, numerous studies have been aimed to reconcile the contradiction between neoliberalism and protectionism in tourism through the *third way* approach (see Burns, 2004; Duffy, 2015; Mitchell, Wooliscroft, & Higham, 2013; Scheyvens, 2007; Schilcher, 2007). This approach can be reflected through a suggestion of an expanded approach for neoliberal scholars with regards to nature other than a kind of tourism resources, as in the study of Duffy (2015). The approach is also reflected through re-assessing the fundamental development question of who benefits the poverty reduction in pro-poor tourism interventions of agencies (Scheyvens, 2007). Likewise, the *third space* approach has widely been employed in the research of CBT marketing, particularly in the context of less-developed countries and under post-colonial approaches. Many studies argue the significance of the *third space* approach to address the polarities of authenticity versus inauthenticity, tourism as a panacea for less-developed countries versus tourism as the root of all problems, modernity versus the primitive, global versus local and other asymmetric choices in CBT development (see Dolezal, 2011; van der Duim et al., 2005). Other studies attempt to elucidate the *third space* model in tourism interactions. These include an investigation on the process of hybridisation occurred in the practice of emergent culture through which the *third space* emerges (Amoano, 2011) or interrogating attributes enabling the *third space* framework among different cultural populations (Leeming, 2016). Due to the potential of the *third way* and *third space* approaches in CBT development and marketing, this research argues for the integration of these two approaches to frame the development of a CBTE collaborative marketing approach for long-term success.

### 2.6. Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the status quo of the literature and identified the knowledge gap in the topic of CBTEs, marketing, and business sustainability. Through the review, the originality of the present study is argued.
CBTEs in less-developed countries are widely regarded as favourable but hardly successful initiatives in particularising tourism sustainable objectives at a grassroots level. Among management approaches to overcoming CBTE challenges, the idea of collaborative marketing involving marketing assistance from external stakeholders is advocated. Marketing assistance to CBTEs structured in multi-stakeholder collaborations rather than in dyadic relationships is promoted to lead CBTEs to long-term success. However, CBTE collaborative marketing confronts polarities in stakeholder perspectives on CBTE business sustainability, in marketing pathways to attain the business sustainability and in stakeholder’s perception on other stakeholders in CBTE marketing networks. At a different aspect of the review, the paradoxes of authenticity versus inauthenticity, modern versus primitive in CBT marketing and the antitheses of post-colonialism versus decolonialism, neoliberalism versus protectionism in CBT development are argued to affect CBTE collaborative marketing. The antitheses impact on marketing tools to attain CBTE sustainability and on stakeholder collaborations in a CBTE marketing network, which consequently determines the outcomes of CBTE collaborative marketing co-efforts.

Certain knowledge gaps emerge from the review. First, linkages between the concepts of CBTE marketing and business sustainability are under-studied. Second, the attributes of CBTE marketing collaboration (i.e., stakeholder inclusion, their position in a CBTE marketing network, facilitators) remain unclear within a multi-stakeholder collaborative approach. Third, there is a lack of a framework to support the engagements of stakeholders with different perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing. Fourth, an alternative approach to the paradoxes associated with CBTE collaborative marketing has not been investigated.

Accordingly, a theoretical framework is argued to address these knowledge gaps. In particular, the collaboration theory is employed to identify the attributes of CBTE marketing collaboration. Additionally, the knowledge co-production is adopted to provide a mechanism for the process of reconciling different perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing. Furthermore, an integration of the third way approach in CBT development and the third space approach in CBT marketing frames the investigation of harmonising paradoxes associated with
CBTE collaborative marketing. The investigations of these knowledge gaps using the proposed theoretical framework are interpreted in the subsequent chapters of this thesis (i.e., Chapters 4 to 6). Through responding to the knowledge gaps, the contributions of this research to the current knowledge of the topic are argued in the Discussion chapter.
Chapter 3: Research methodology

3.1. Introduction

In the Literature Review chapter, the crucial knowledge gaps related to this research are identified. They include: the linkages between the concepts of CBTE marketing and business sustainability are under-studied; the attributes of CBTE marketing collaboration (i.e., stakeholder inclusion, their position in a CBTE marketing network, facilitator) remain unclear within a multi-stakeholder collaborative approach; there is a lack of a framework to support the engagements of stakeholders with different perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing; an alternative approach to the paradoxes associated with CBTE collaborative marketing has not been investigated. It is inevitable that the manner in which these gaps are addressed will affect the research outcomes.

Likewise, as this study involves research participants of diverse voices, interactions between researchers and research participants will also regulate the research outcomes. The interaction is practised in association with power relationships among the knowledge holders of different perspectives and cosmologies. Power and knowledge are intricately interwoven and determine the processes of knowledge generation (Gaventa & Cornwall, 2008; Wearing & McDonald, 2002). An investigation into the relations of power and knowledge helps to underpin an epistemological approach to the research of CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability.

In tourism research with suppressed people and marginalised voices, power inequities between external stakeholders and local communities, Western-based perspectives and indigenous knowledge, and academic scholars and practitioners in knowledge generation processes prevail (Carr et al., 2016; Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2014; Taylor, 2016). The privilege of generating knowledge is in the hands of those knowledge holders conventionally exercising power. For instance, Western perspectives overwhelmingly dominate over indigenous knowledge in shaping knowledge stocks relating to ecotourism.
(Donohoe, 2011). Those knowledge-colonised studies are categorised as research on people (Koster, Baccar, & Lemelin, 2012; Nielsen & Wilson, 2012). Under the research on people, marginalised participants and indigenous knowledge are obscured, and their perspectives are invisible in the research process. However, positioning local communities’ thought, indigenous knowledge, and practitioners’ viewpoints as marginalised, “other” in knowledge generation processes frequently result in unfavourable outcomes. A paternalistic approach in research involving people may result in the research-practice gap (Dredge et al., 2013, Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010).

Concomitantly, there is an increasing significance of collaborative and Indigenous-driven studies, where marginalised voices, indigenous knowledge, and subaltern stakeholders are empowered in the research process. Such studies are classified as research with people and for people (Koster et al., 2012; Nielsen & Wilson, 2012). This research category is argued to empower practical wisdom, revitalise ancestral knowledge, and strengthen self-determination and autonomy. An Indigenous-driven study in Canada by Holmes, Grimwood, King, and Nation (2016) stated that a visitor code of conduct could be generated by the aboriginal community. This guideline is rich in moral and cultural values and can supplement literature on sustainable tourism with socially robust insights.

Additionally, through collaborative research between academics and indigenous people, indigenous people may experience awareness raising, cognitive changes, and capacity building opportunities (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). Indeed, not just marginalised research participants benefit from decolonisation in the relations of power and knowledge, but also embodied researchers, who experience benefits through their entanglement in a collaborative research process (Ateljevic, Harris, Wilson, & Collins, 2005; Davidson-Hunt & Michael O’Flaherty, 2007). For instance, Berkes (2009b) notes changes in scientists over 14 years of collaborating with indigenous knowledge in a project of ecological conservation in New Zealand. She states that the involved researchers became more open to other knowledge sources and less over-confident of scientific knowledge. Likewise, Dredge et al., (2013) contested an improvement of research skills among the involved researchers and a re-positioning of the self
towards issues like social justice, social changes, moral-based knowledge generation and ethics, while entangled in a community case study research. The transformation among embodied co-researchers results in shortening the research-practice gap and activating social changes.

Thus, decolonialism in knowledge generation processes is advocated in this research, in which the privilege of generating knowledge is better delivered among relevant knowledge holders (Carr et al., 2016; Lemelin & Blangy, 2009). Under a decolonial approach, local communities, practitioners and researchers communicate, and Western perspectives and practical wisdom interact to address a knowledge domain. However, there is a paucity of studies elaborating the idea of decolonialism of knowledge making in a collaborative study. The present research addresses this paucity through the knowledge co-production approach employed to frame the research methodology.

Accordingly, this chapter focuses on explaining the research methodology and how a methodological framework is established to guide the data collection and analysis. Through presenting a methodological framework assisting the research findings, this chapter aims to argue the potential of the knowledge co-production approach to underpin knowledge generation processes in collaborative research. Indications supporting the argument are presented lately in the research findings chapters (Chapters 4 to 6).

This chapter includes a co-authored paper. The paper in the thesis's format is incorporated in the next subsection. The bibliographic details of the co-authored paper, including all authors, are:


My contribution to the paper involved: initiating the concepts, designing the investigation, structuring the manuscript and drafting the manuscript.
3.2. (The paper - In press) Knowledge co-production in tourism and the process of knowledge development: Participatory action research.
Knowledge co-production in tourism and the process of knowledge development: Participatory action research

Tramy Ngo, Gui Lohmann and Rob Hales

Abstract

This chapter provides insights from a knowledge co-production study on collaborative marketing for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises under a constructivist paradigm. Based on participatory action research (PAR), the process of developing knowledge through the involvement of various research stakeholders in different stages of the research process is investigated. The lessons learnt from applying the knowledge co-production approach through PAR in a tourism study are presented. In addition, implications for further research to develop this methodology in the realm of tourism are suggested.

Keywords: constructivism, knowledge co-production, PAR, knowledge development process, collaborative marketing, CBTEs.

Introduction

Community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) are micro-scaled, rural and remote area-located businesses of which the local community is the owner, the manager and the main beneficiary. Although CBTEs have proliferated in less developed countries because of their potential to transform sustainable tourism objectives into actions, only a few CBTEs can claim to be successful (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Rocharungsat, 2008). Most CBTE projects experience market failure and collapse after the funding period (Dixey, 2008; Mielke, 2012). In studies of CBTEs, a collaborative approach is widely advocated to help CBTEs overcome their marketing challenges and shift their businesses towards long-term success (Dodds, Ali & Galaski, 2016; Idziak, Majewski & Zmyślony, 2015; Mbaiwa, Stronza & Kreuter, 2011). Accordingly, there is a need to develop a collaborative marketing approach to underpin stakeholder relationships in marketing co-efforts for the business sustainability of CBTEs. The development of such an approach
necessitates the involvement of multiple stakeholders with different perspectives. To this end, collaborative forms of knowledge generation are proposed (Carr, Ruhanen, & Whitford, 2016; Torres-Delgado & Saarinen, 2014). In particular, where subaltern viewpoints and marginalised voices are involved, these should be integrated into knowledge generation (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015). Owing to the recognition of different forms of knowledge (Berkes, 2009), knowledge co-production approach is appropriate to frame the development of a collaborative marketing approach for CBTE sustainability. The knowledge co-production approach is governed by the constructivist paradigm and is facilitated in research processes through participatory action research (PAR) (Castleden Morgan, & Lamb; 2012; Espeso-Molinero, Carlisle & Pastor-Alfonso, 2016).

**Constructivism as a research paradigm**

A research paradigm consists of “the basic belief system or worldview that guides the investigator, not only in the choice of the method but in ontological and epistemological fundamental ways” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p. 105). A research paradigm reflects the standpoints of researchers regarding ontological, epistemological, and methodological stances. Accordingly, a research paradigm underpins the entanglement of researchers and research participants in the research process, the tools and techniques of data collection and analysis, the interpretation of research outcomes, and the evaluation of research contributions. According to Guba and Lincoln (1994), the selection of a specific research paradigm is dependent on the answers to ontological, epistemological and methodological questions, which include, "What is the form and nature of reality and, therefore, what is there that can be known about it?"; “What is the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be-knower and what can be known?”; and “How can the inquirer (would-be-knower) go about finding whatever he or she believes can be known?”. Answering the ontological question determines the answers to the epistemological and methodological questions and shapes a selected research paradigm.

As the study of collaborative marketing for the business sustainability of CBTEs involves stakeholders with different perspectives, a constructivism approach is adopted as the research paradigm. The constructivism approach, according to
Guba (1990), admits the multiple realities that exist in the minds of the “insiders” and attempts to obtain one or a few constructions that are reconciled from different perspectives. Multiple realities co-exist because of the interpretation of perspectives belonging to different cosmologies. A constructivism-based study should focus on the values constructed at the *inter-sphere* of different perspectives. It is argued that this paradigm effectively supports the investigations of highly contextualised problem domains, in which different worldviews co-exist and might be incongruent with each other (Hollinshead, 2006). Based on the constructivism paradigm, a co-construction approach to knowledge generation is adopted to guide the research process. The knowledge co-production approach and its applications in the research stages are illustrated in the rest of this chapter.

**Knowledge co-production in tourism research**

Knowledge co-production refers to an interactive approach to knowledge generation in which researchers and research participants interact and influence each other to different degrees in generating socially constructed knowledge (Dale & Armitage, 2011). Knowledge co-production is based on the premise that knowledge generation is an outcome of collaborative interactions among researchers and research participants. Researchers possess evidence-based perspectives in the academic world, whereas research participants represent diverse viewpoints of the social world. Knowledge co-production allows a research participant to reconcile his or her perspectives with those of others. New knowledge is developed through interactions between researchers and research participants. The new knowledge is socially constructed and is characterised by its dual attributes of scientific validity and social relevance (Nowotny, 2003). Moreover, in the realm of knowledge co-production, each research participant is both a knowledge generator and a social learner (Berkes, 2009; Dale & Armitage, 2011; Pohl et al., 2010). Here, participants co-generate knowledge through interactions and concomitantly experience a social learning process through their interactions.

Castleden et al. (2012) argue that five attributes define a knowledge co-production study. First, both researchers and research participants share ownership in establishing the study’s direction and process stages. The researchers should be
flexible in experimenting with different research approaches throughout the research process. Second, the perspectives of both researchers and research participants are regarded as a legitimate source of knowledge. Data collected from the research participants are regarded as an independent school of thought without being subjugated to scientific knowledge. Third, reflective learning among researchers and research participants is promoted. Fourth, new knowledge is co-generated. Fifth, new knowledge is disseminated in accordance with the culture, values, and beliefs of the viewpoints involved to obtain mutual benefits.

The application of a knowledge co-production approach in tourism studies is increasing. Most of the tourism studies using the knowledge co-production approach focus on sustainability: they include natural resource management, climate change adaptation and destination sustainability. For instance, numerous studies investigate the significance of the knowledge co-production approach in the management and governance of natural resources in tourist destinations (see Marshall, Viegas, Frey, & Ribeiro, 2016; Ungar & Strand, 2012). Climate change adaptation for destination sustainability is another domain in which the knowledge co-production approach is employed (see Armitage, Berkes, Dale, Kocho-Schellenberg, & Patton, 2011). The emergence of the knowledge co-production approach within the broad discipline of sustainability can inform tourism studies. Nevertheless, few tourism studies have used the knowledge co-production approach (Becken, Zammit, & Hendrikx, 2015; Espeso-Moliner et al., 2016). Moreover, the scarcity of tourism research using the knowledge co-production approach contrasts with the recurrent call for its application in tourism studies (Carr et al., 2016; Chambers & Buzinde, 2015).

A majority of knowledge co-production studies focuses on the significance of this approach in terms of integrating two different ways of knowing, i.e., indigenous knowledge and scientific knowledge, for the benefit of collaborative knowledge. Current knowledge co-production studies investigate collaborative works between Western-based knowledge and indigenous knowledge (Armitage et al., 2011; Davidson-Hunt & Michael O'Flaherty, 2007; Weiss, Hamann, & Marsh, 2013) and between intellectual works in the North and those in the South (Castleden et al., 2012; Chambers & Buzinde, 2015). There is an absence of studies illustrating the
potential of a knowledge co-production approach for harmonising practitioner standpoints and researcher viewpoints. This paucity is in contrast with a recent burgeoning of tourism studies arguing that the capacity of the knowledge co-production approach can bridge the research-practice gap (Dredge & Jamal, 2015; Font & McCabe, 2017). Additionally, owing to its acknowledgement of different standpoints and appreciation of the voices of the marginalised, the knowledge co-production approach has the potential to reconcile diverse perspectives in collective efforts. However, it remains an under-studied item on the tourism agenda. Thus, by conducting a case study in the domain of CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability, we argue that the knowledge co-production approach can responsively address diverse perspectives in collaborative works, shorten the research-practice gap, and thereby contribute to the discussion of knowledge co-production in the tourism context.

On a different scale, although many studies investigate the significance of knowledge co-generation in terms of problem-solving (Marshall et al., 2016; Ungar & Strand, 2012) and the outcomes of the knowledge co-production process (Becken et al., 2015; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Holmes, Grimwood, King, & Lutsel, 2016), less attention has been paid to illustrating how to develop knowledge through collaborations among knowledge holders. The knowledge development process should encompass the generation of socially constructed, value-based knowledge through interactions among research stakeholders while including those stakeholders’ reflections on their learning experience throughout the process. We attempt to address this gap by interrogating the process of knowledge development in a knowledge co-production study focused on CBTE collaborative marketing.

Accordingly, the PAR approach is employed in the investigation process to achieve the aim of this study. PAR is a useful tool for learning promotion and knowledge co-generation (Kindon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007; Reason & Bradburry, 2008), and it is, therefore an important part of the knowledge co-production process. More specifically, PAR provides a methodological framework for exploring diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing, bringing them together for
knowledge interactions and evaluating learning outcomes achieved through an action learning cycle.

**PAR in the knowledge co-production study of CBTE collaborative marketing**

*Participatory action research*

PAR is an integrated paradigm of participatory approaches and action-oriented research. More specifically, PAR refers to an inquiry-based approach in which relevant participants in a research project change and improve a problem by actively examining it together (Kindon et al., 2007). Through this research process, researchers and research participants jointly produce knowledge that is understandable, actionable, and accessible to them. Thus, participant collaboration and knowledge co-production shape the PAR methodology.

In PAR, the research process is designed through recurring stages of research, action and reflection (Kindon et al., 2007), as illustrated in Table 1. PAR values two types of research outcomes. First, the collective actions and quality information generated are counted as research contributions. Second, the self-mobilisation of research participants in terms of skills, knowledge and capacities throughout the research experience is also evaluated (Kindon et al., 2007). Following this process, collaborative methods and research implementation techniques are employed. Aligning with the flexibility and non-coercive nature of PAR, methodological techniques are very diverse. They can be based on traditional tools such as interviews, and focus groups, and on innovative tools using technology, for instance, diagrams and videos (Kindon et al., 2007). Method selection is context-based and considers research participants’ capabilities and resources. Flexible research contributions in PAR and diverse methodological tools reinforce the prevalence of PAR in the tourism literature.
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Table 1: Stages of the PAR process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>The research participants identify a context-pertinent problem that needs to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>The research participants interact and arrive at a set of actions for change or improvement. The set of actions is aligned with research participants’ capabilities and is context-plausible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>The research participants experience learning and reflection during the action implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Adopted from Kindon et al., 2007)

*PAR as a methodological framework for knowledge development in the knowledge co-production study of CBTE collaborative marketing*

In the realm of tourism, PAR has been used extensively in sustainable tourism research (Cole, 2006; Idziak et al., 2015). PAR is regarded as an effective approach to integrating different viewpoints and multiple disciplines in sustainable tourism, fostering the potential to achieve sustainable tourism in practice and at the grassroots level. The method has been utilised to empower the indigenous communities, which are conventionally viewed as marginalised in the tourism planning process (see Cole, 2006; Idziak et al., 2015). On a different scale, PAR facilitates individual and social changes towards sustainability (see Jamal & Watt, 2011). The implications of PAR for empowering marginalised voices in the research process and facilitating learning outcomes for participants validate its potential as a base framework to assess the knowledge co-production process.

Indeed, the process of knowledge development through harmonising diverse perspectives in developing a responsive collaborative marketing approach for CBTE sustainability can be facilitated by PAR. First, the acknowledgement of diverse viewpoints in PAR allows different types and sources of knowledge to be voiced in the process of knowledge co-production. PAR arguably amplifies the voices of research participants, specifically those of indigenous knowledge holders. Accordingly, indigenous knowledge is recognised and actively engaged in co-
generating new knowledge. Second, it is argued that PAR’s action-based principle facilitates knowledge interactions, which remain central to the knowledge co-production process. The interactions of different types and sources of knowledge are used to achieve a new socially constructed, value-based knowledge that embraces the viewpoints of different knowledge holders. Third, the PAR attribute of learning through engagement paves the way to assessing learning experiences, as reflected by both the researchers and the research participants in the knowledge co-production process. Thus, PAR is used to construct a research design, as illustrated later in this chapter, to explore the process of knowledge development through the collaborative works of researchers and CBTE stakeholders in different stages of the study of CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainability.

**Research context**

The context of this study is CBTEs in Vietnam. Specifically, three CBTEs in Vietnam were approached: Triem Tay Floating Restaurant, Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery, and Minh Tho Homestay. These CBTEs, which were selected using the purposive sampling method, represent different development models and diverse marketing approaches of CBTEs in Vietnam. Table 2 provides background information on the investigated CBTEs.
Table 2: Background information of the investigated CBTEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triem Tay Floating</td>
<td>Triem Tay Village, Quang Nam Province</td>
<td>Was launched in June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>3 km from Hoi An City, a tourist centre</td>
<td>Is owned by a Kinh [1] family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The village is facing out-migration issues due to land erosion (ILO, 2015)</td>
<td>Received support from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and UNESCO for technical training, field trips, marketing and promotion, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Offers food and beverage packages and boating experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is a member of Triem Tay's CBTE co-operative [2], which was established in September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanh Toan Gardening</td>
<td>Thanh Toan Village, Thua Thien Hue Province</td>
<td>Was established in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Cookery</td>
<td>8 km from Hue City, a tourist centre</td>
<td>Is owned by a Kinh family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The village is renowned for Thanh Toan Tile-Roofed Bridge, a National Heritage Site and a tourist attraction</td>
<td>Was formerly supported by the Japan International Corporation Agency (JICA), SNV, followed by the ILO and UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services include gardening experience and cooking classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] The Kinh people are the majority ethnic group of Vietnam

[2] The CBTE co-operative is a form of community alliances that specialises in tourism. This co-op is a community institution consisting of member CBTEs and acting as a representative of the member entrepreneurs. Usually, a committee of selected members is responsible for the management of the co-op. In Vietnam, CBTE co-ops, similar to other communal cooperatives, are legally integrated into the over-arching Vietnam Cooperative Alliance, a non-profit organisation whose purpose is to support members through consulting, training, and providing a voice for policy change.
Research design

The research was designed in associations with the knowledge development process framed by the three-stage PAR of Kindon et al. (2007). The knowledge development process began with a knowledge exploration stage, followed by knowledge interaction and then a knowledge reflection stage before starting the next process. Along with this process, the research design consists of two stages. Figure 1 visually presents the linkages between the knowledge development process underpinned by PAR and the stages of the research design.

---

[3] The Thai people are one of the minority ethnic groups of Vietnam

[4] COHED: Centre for Community Health and Development

[5] CBT Travel is a travel agency specialising in CBT products and services in Vietnam, self-labelled as a social enterprise. It initiated the approach “franchised CBT” approach. Under this approach, CBT Travel facilitates CBT initiatives (mostly homestays) equipped with standard facilities and services to fulfil travellers’ needs. The projects are then handed over to local entrepreneurs through franchising partnerships in which CBT Travel is responsible for sales, marketing and service quality control related to the projects. At the time of the investigation, CBT Travel supported Minh Tho Homestay with sales and marketing.
Figure 1: Knowledge development process included in the research design

(Source: Adopted from PAR process of Kindon et al., 2007)

Stage 1 - Interviews

The perspectives of CBTE stakeholders regarding CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives and marketing proposals for CBTE sustainability were investigated at this stage. To address this objective, the interviewing method was adapted. Thirty key stakeholders directly involved in the three CBTEs were identified as interview respondents through the purposive sampling method and snowball techniques. Respondents were asked about their viewpoints related to who is included in and who facilitates a CBTE marketing network, the factors of success for CBTE collaborative marketing and how such an approach leads to the business sustainability of CBTEs. They were also asked about a proposal of marketing strategies oriented towards CBTE long-term success. The interviews were conducted face-to-face in public places at the convenience of the respondents in the period from November 2015 to January 2016.

Content analysis and narrative analysis were utilised to interpret the interviewing data. As a result, collaborative marketing alternatives for the business sustainability of CBTEs shaped by stakeholders from different perspectives and
categories were elucidated. From these collaborative marketing alternatives, the incongruence of perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing emerged.

Stage 2 - Workshop

At this stage, stakeholders with different perspectives communicated to explore other perspectives and obtain a shared understanding regarding a collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs. Knowledge interaction occurred on a platform that can be established using collective learning tools. In this study, a group discussion was selected to facilitate knowledge interactions (Barbour, 2008). Because of time and budget limitations, the group discussion took the form of a half-day workshop.

Workshop planning consisted of three tasks: setting the day, time, venue of the workshop and incentives for workshop participants; inviting participants and maintaining their interest in the workshop; gathering the workshop facilitator’s team. As the workshop involved multiple stakeholders from both the public and private sector, Friday morning was suggested as best likely to attract participants. Additionally, the community hall was deemed the best option to serve as the workshop’s venue, given that the workshop was about CBTEs, collaborative marketing and sustainability. Regarding the participation incentives, workshop participants were offered the option of arranged one-night accommodation or an equivalent amount of cash to maximise their likelihood of attending. As a result, the workshop was held on the morning of 17 March 2017 in the community hall of Triem Tay Village, Quang Nam province, Vietnam.

Regarding the workshop participants, thirty interview respondents were targeted with an invitation email or phone call. The email and phone call specified the workshop objectives, i.e., sharing interview outcomes and discussing CBTE collaborative marketing issues that emerged from the interviews. Only five invitees out of thirty accepted the invitation. Three other participants suggested sending representatives to participate in the workshop. Considering a desired group discussion size of eight to 12 participants (Jennings, 2010; Krueger & Casey, 2014), the recommendations of participants who had accepted, and the need to have representatives of all categories of CBTE stakeholders, three additional
participants were invited. Overall, eleven people accepted invitations to participate. Unexpectedly, four participants, who had heard about the workshop expressed interest in attending and were accepted because the workshop's purpose was to obtain and share knowledge. Therefore, fifteen people ultimately participated. Following the invitations, various activities were conducted to maintain the participants' interest in the workshop. In particular, a video briefly summarising the interview outcomes and introducing the workshop objectives was sent to participants two weeks before the workshop. An infographic detailing the collaborative marketing alternatives was sent to the participants one week after the video.

The final workshop-planning task was to build a team of workshop facilitators. The main researcher travelled to Vietnam one week before the workshop to host the event. Vietnam is the main researcher's home country. Thus, she had advantages of her acquaintance with the culture, language and social networks, all of which helped her to organise the workshop successfully. In addition to the main researcher, two other facilitating members were hired. The facilitating members were based in Da Nang city, an area adjacent to the workshop venue. They were senior tourism students at the University of Economics (Da Nang) with experience in co-hosting conferences and social events. However, the most important criterion for selecting the workshop facilitating members was their interest in learning from the workshop, given that learning was crucial to all dimensions and stages of the study.

The workshop was conducted in the form of roundtable discussions to facilitate a power-free environment for all voices (Ross et al., 2015). Participants discussed the explanation behind diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and negotiated with each other to finalise a common understanding of the topic. Participants were also provided with a proposed marketing strategy tailor-made for CBTE sustainability in Vietnam for a review and feedback.

Data from the workshop were analysed using content analysis and thematic analysis. Through data analysis, a collaborative marketing framework was developed for the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries.
The interview and workshop data was also subject to a grounded approach to research (thematic analysis in tandem with document analysis) to propose, develop and refine the components of a marketing strategy tailor-made for the long-term success of CBTEs in Vietnam.

**Lessons adhered to the engagement of multiple voices to co-generate knowledge in a knowledge co-production study**

Along with the implementation of the research process, the principle of power-sharing was recognised. Power sharing is highlighted as one of the advantages of PAR (Liamputtong, 2013). In PAR, the power of legitimate knowledge holders, which is conventionally possessed by researchers, is decentralised to research participants. Thus, PAR encourages empowerment and confidence among research participants to engage in the research process. Specifically, a knowledge co-production study, framed by PAR principles, advocates for the decolonisation of ways of knowing among co-researchers through their engagement in the research process (Chamber & Buzinde, 2015). However, a transforming this attribute into various stages of the research process is a challenge that has repeatedly been raised in knowledge co-production studies (Cornwall, 2004; Pohl et al., 2010).

Accordingly, in our study, various steps were taken to facilitate a sense of fair relations of power and knowledge among research stakeholders. First, in terms of data collection, the interview questions were designed and delivered flexibly to optimise the exploration of respondents’ perspectives. They were structured in a basic manner with “How do you think” or “What are your ideas” questions supplemented by “why” questions to clarify the respondents’ viewpoints. Additionally, the interview questions were intentionally flexible to make them answerable within the boundaries of all respondents’ perceptions. Likewise, in the workshop, the participants were distributed across three concurrent group discussions to ensure that knowledge interactions amplified the voices of marginalised knowledge holders (e.g., local entrepreneurs, community representatives). Additionally, open-ended survey questions at the end of the workshop encouraged participants to add any ideas that they had not shared during the workshop. Second, regarding the data analysis, the assessment of interviews’ data was independent from Western-driven knowledge. Furthermore,
a narrative analysis was employed to explore insights from the respondents’ perspectives in accordance with their own way of knowing. Third, the role of the main researcher as a knowledge facilitator rather than a knowledge disseminator was reiterated via different channels of communication with the research participant (i.e., during interviews, in emails, in the video and infographic sent to the workshop participants, and during the workshop). Finally, the research participants were entitled to “read” the research outputs through the video, infographic and presentation briefing illustrating the research findings that were delivered to them.

Along with the democracy of expertise disseminated equitably among research stakeholders, the trustworthiness of data was taken into consideration. This trustworthiness is identified through four criteria, that is, credibility (internal validity), transferability (external validity), dependability (reliability), and confirmability (objectivity) (Shenton, 2004). The strategies recommended by Shenton (2004) to promote the trustworthiness of data in the qualitative research process were applied in our study. For instance, the main researcher was acquainted with the study context (Vietnam) beforehand. The field trip for interviews was prolonged over four months to interview 30 participants. The main researcher constantly implemented reflexivity during the data collection and analysis stages. Data triangulation was achieved as follows: the data collection was undertaken in two stages – interviews and a workshop; the informants were able to check the information after the interviews and workshop; document analysis of the current wealth of knowledge was conducted in conjunction with primary data analysis. The initial data analysis completed by the main researcher was reviewed by the other two researchers (in the role of supervisors), academic fellows (through submitted manuscripts to peer-reviewed publications), and CBTE stakeholders (via the workshop).

**Conclusion**

This chapter interrogates the knowledge development process incorporated into a knowledge co-production study investigating a collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries. The knowledge development process is methodologically underpinned by the three-
stage PAR framework developed by Kindon et al. (2007). The research paradigm presented in this chapter illustrates that PAR provides a framework for the attributes of a knowledge co-production approach to be embedded in the stages of the research process. Concurrently, this research paradigm indicates that value-based knowledge and social learning outcomes can be generated through the involvement of various research stakeholders.

Although this study has used the principles of the knowledge co-production approach, it fails to satisfy the attributes of authorship sharing and identification of knowledge holders. Given that the research participants were Vietnamese and their official language was Vietnamese, attribution of authorship was problematic and not addressed in this research. The Australian-based researchers were also confronted with language barriers, as they could not communicate directly with Vietnamese participants. As a compromise, research participants were added to the publications in the acknowledgements section. Development of further research methods that seek to facilitate the authorship of research participants of multiple languages within the co-constructed method is warranted.
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Chapter 4: The collaboration of multiple stakeholders in marketing for the business sustainability of CBTEs

4. 1. Introduction

The review of the marketing and business sustainability of CBTEs, as interpreted in Chapter 2, indicates that this topic is neglected in the tourism research agenda. CBTE marketing is subject to co-efforts, in which external stakeholders, local entrepreneurs and communities collaborate to promote a CBTE to achieve long-term success. Concurrently, CBTE marketing is regarded as a domain for sustainable tourism marketing initiatives, where strategic marketing activities influence the attainment of business sustainability objectives of an organisation. However, the attributes of a CBTE marketing collaboration (i.e., stakeholder inclusions, their position in a CBTE marketing network, and a collaboration facilitator) remain unclear, and the linkages between the concepts of CBTE marketing and business sustainability are under-studied.

Thus, this chapter aims to examine collaborative marketing alternatives for the business sustainability of CBTEs from the viewpoints of CBTE stakeholders (RO1). In particular, this chapter’s objectives are twofold: investigates CBTE stakeholders’ perspectives on CBTE business sustainability that regulate their proposal of a CBTE marketing collaboration; and identify stakeholder inclusion, central linkages, and a facilitator included in the proposed CBTE marketing collaboration.

Regarding a methodological framework for the investigation undertaken in this chapter, a constructivism paradigm and a knowledge co-production approach, as indicated in Chapter 3, are suggested. This methodological framework underpins the process of collecting, analysing and interpreting the data to address the chapter's objectives.
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Collaborative marketing for the sustainable development of community-based tourism enterprises: voices from the field
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ABSTRACT
This paper examines stakeholder engagement in the collaborative marketing of community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs). The study explored the various collaborative marketing approaches shaped by diverse stakeholders’ perspectives on ways to achieve the sustainable development of CBTEs in Vietnam. The results of 30 in-depth, semi-structured interviews from three CBTEs in Vietnam showed that three collaborative marketing approaches were prevailed among CBTE stakeholders and were categorised as commercial viability-driven, community development-driven and balanced approaches. The approaches’ differences were reflected in the marketing objectives to achieve CBTE sustainability, the central linkages of CBTE collaborative marketing, and the facilitators of stakeholder collaboration. The research found a knowledge gap between researchers and research participants and divergent perspectives among different categories of research participants regarding marketing and CBTE sustainability. This paper implies the role of a knowledge co-production approach to drive the stakeholder engagement in CBTE collaborative marketing for CBTEs’ long-term success. Additionally, this study provides insights into the discussion of marketing for sustainable tourism. Furthermore, the findings contribute to a better understanding of the collaborative approach at the organisational level.

Introduction
It is contended that community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) possess the potential to create jobs for locals, diversify the sources of livelihoods, offer additional income, facilitate the community’s empowerment, and contribute to conservation efforts (Kibicho, 2008; Lemelin, Koster, & Youroukos, 2015; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). Due to such promising objectives, numerous CBTE projects have been proliferating in less developed countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America (Carlisle, Kunc, Jones, & Tiffin, 2013; Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2014; Mielke, 2012). However, the majority of those CBTEs collapse after the funded period (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Rocharungsat, 2008; Weaver, 2010). Among other reasons, poor market access is consistently blamed for the business failure of CBTEs (Dixey, 2008; Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2016; Häusler, 2008; Mielke, 2012). Nevertheless, few commercially successful CBTEs are criticised of not addressing community development objectives in their business success (Manyara & Jones, 2005; Snyman, 2014). Those CBTEs mostly owe their commercial success to joint-venture partnerships between them and tour operators, in which the private
partner takes charge of the CBTE marketing (Lucchetti & Font, 2013; Snyman, 2012; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Although the topic of marketing has been reiteratively cited in the literature of CBTE assessment, surprisingly, the study of CBTE marketing and business sustainability has not been closely examined.

Stakeholder collaboration and partnerships are consistently touted as being among the indicators of CBTE success and are well addressed through academic studies and the “grey” literature (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard, & Paddon, 2010; Dodds et al., 2016; Lucchetti & Font, 2013). However, there is still a lack of research investigating how CBTE collaborative marketing promotes business sustainability for CBTEs. This study aims to address this gap by examining stakeholder engagement in collaborative marketing efforts for the sustainable development of CBTEs in Vietnam. In particular, this investigation employs a constructivist approach to knowledge to (1) investigate CBTE stakeholders’ perspectives on CBTE sustainability that affect their proposals of CBTE collaborative marketing and (2) identify stakeholder inclusion, central linkages, and facilitators included in the proposed collaborative marketing approaches. The paper implies the role of a knowledge co-production approach to drive stakeholder engagement in CBTE collaborative marketing for CBTEs’ long-term success. Additionally, this paper provides insights to the discussion of marketing for sustainable tourism. Furthermore, the findings contribute to a better understanding of the collaborative approach at the organisational level. The research outcomes can be applied to other CBTE contexts, reflecting the practical contribution of this project.

**Community-based tourism enterprises**

A CBTE is an enterprise-based approach to a community-based tourism (CBT) initiative in support of entrepreneurship to achieve sustainable development. Three main criteria identify a CBTE: local community ownership of the venture; full community involvement in the venture’s operation and management; and the community as the main beneficiary of the initiative (Spenceley, 2008). In developed countries such as Australia (Damien, 2016; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2014) and Canada (Lemelin et al., 2015), a CBTE is regarded as an “Aboriginal/Indigenous tourism business”. The term CBTE predominantly appears in organisations in Africa and Latin America (Armstrong, 2012; Jones, 2008; Manyara & Jones, 2007). As the term CBTE is used in reference to operations in less developed countries, it is adopted in this research.

**Marketing and the sustainable development of CBTEs**

The sustainable development of CBTEs refers to an attainment of commercial viability combined with the fulfilment of non-economic indicators of success. Specifically, CBTEs are deemed to achieve sustainable development if they balance the realisation of economic benefits for locals with cultural and environmental preservation, and fundamentally identify themselves as a tool for promoting the social, cultural, and place characteristics of the community (Carr, Ruhanen, & Whitford, 2016). It is argued that stakeholders engaging in CBTE development should be aware of and acknowledge the fundamental principles of CBTE sustainability. The stakeholders’ interventions, if not guided by evidence-based knowledge, might cause adverse impacts in the long term (Ruhanen, 2008).

The assessment of the sustainable development of CBTEs is subject to different perspectives. CBTE stakeholders define the long-term success of CBTEs differently depending on their own understanding of the concept (Lai, Li, & Scott, 2015). Additionally, there is a conflict over the meaning of the key terms relating to CBTEs and their sustainability. Medina (2005) describes a disagreement among Belizean ecotourism stakeholders and between them and foreign experts regarding the definitions of “locals”, “benefits”, and “participants” to certify a business as ecotourism. At a different scale, Higgins-Desbiolles, Trevorrow, and Sparrow (2014) argue that there are inconsistencies between Western perspectives and Indigenous viewpoints regarding what constitutes the “success” of an Aboriginal business in Australia. Discrepancies in the many definitions of sustainable CBTE cause disparities in
assessing CBTE success. Indeed, Taylor (2016), in a study of a CBT project in a rural Mayan village in Yucatan, Mexico, indicates inconsistencies in the project assessment between the project planners and the affected community due to their different perceptions of the success indicators.

Additionally, different stakeholders assess CBTEs with reference to pre-identified conceptual references. For instance, SNV, a Netherlands-based development organisation, specifying poverty alleviation as the benchmark for achieving sustainable tourism initiatives, generated a set of metrics for its projects (Hummel, Gujadhur, & Ritsma, 2013). Ruhanen (2013) argues that the government, although assumed to be an impartial stakeholder in sustainable tourism development, actually overemphasises commercial interests. Local entrepreneurs engage in tourism business activities with a focus on economic incentives (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Truong, Hall, & Garry, 2014), which consequently affect their interpretation of business success. The pre-identified assumptions of one stakeholder might be inconsistent with those of the other stakeholders in the assessment of CBTE success. Therefore, we argue that all stakeholders engaging in a CBTE collaborative marketing project must embrace a common understanding of what constitutes the sustainable development of CBTEs.

Marketing is regarded as significantly impacting the achievement of CBTE sustainability. This approach fits into a broader debate about the power of organisational marketing, beyond its economic benefits, to influence other objectives of the entrepreneurship for the sustainable development of a tourism business (Gilmore, Carson, & Ascencão, 2007; Mitchell, Wooliscroft, & Higham, 2010; Pomering, Noble, & Johnson, 2011). Indeed, numerous studies argue that marketing has the potential to balance dichotomous objectives in tourism management to achieve sustainable development (Buhalis, 2000; Donohoe, 2012; Sharpley & Pearce, 2007). Particularly in those CBTEs aiming to achieve both commercial viability and community development objectives, the marketing tools utilised for economic objectives need to be harmonised with their impacts on non-economic objectives. However, there is a paucity of studies investigating the potential of marketing for sustainability in the realm of CBTEs. Thus, we attempt to address the paucity by investigating the attainment of CBTE sustainability through the lens of marketing.

**CBTE marketing partnerships**

The CBTE literature defines the stakeholders of CBTEs. A stakeholder is “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by, the achievement of a corporation’s purpose” (Freeman, 1984, p. 25). Specifically, tour operators are considered essential stakeholders of CBTE development because of their market expertise and experience (Snyman, 2014; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Tour operators act as facilitators, marketing intermediaries, and product development advisors for CBTE development (WTO, 2002). The tourism literature also contains frequent mentions of non-economic stakeholders such as non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community associations, marketing social enterprises, and CBTE networks, involved in CBTE development (Dodds et al., 2016; Forstner, 2004). Table 1 summarises the stakeholders who may be involved in a CBTE development and their potential marketing supports.

Stakeholder collaboration is important to CBTE development, particularly in marketing. In the rural and peripheral regions of less developed countries, local communities demonstrate very little knowledge of the tourism market, tourist demands, and tourism business (Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008). The CBTEs initiated in those regions also encounter physical and cultural isolation from tourists (Dixey, 2008; Forstner, 2004; Goodwin, 2006). Furthermore, the small scale of CBTEs prevents them from being sufficiently financed for marketing purposes (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). The poor marketing capability of the local entrepreneurs, exacerbated by the remoteness and limited resources of the entrepreneurship, challenges the CBTEs to market their business independently. Indeed, numerous studies argue that there is a need for external marketing assistance for CBTEs (Notzke, 2004; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013). Engaging with other stakeholders not only endows CBTEs with collaborative advantages but also makes up for CBTEs’ lack of business skills and financial resources (Dixey, 2008; Moscardo, 2008).
Notably, multiple stakeholder collaborations, rather than dyadic relations, are argued to better promote the sustainable development of CBTEs (Asker et al., 2010; Manyara & Jones, 2005). It is argued that the objectives of commercial viability and community development for CBTE sustainability cannot be successfully addressed by dyadic partnerships. For instance, joint venturing between a CBTE and a tour operator can significantly leverage for market access for CBTEs, but their ability to contribute to community well-being is still in doubt (Manyara & Jones, 2005). Likewise, an NGO’s sponsorship of a CBTE, aimed at community empowerment, gender equality and other non-economic priorities, might unsuccessfully offer market-ready products (Mielke, 2012; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011). The potential benefits of collaborative linkages, combined with the dual objectives for CBTE long-term success, advocate for CBTE collaborative marketing approaches that involve a wide range of stakeholders. In such marketing approaches, the objectives of tourism prosperity, community empowerment, and self-sustainable CBTEs can be equitably promoted (Carlisle et al., 2013; Manyara & Jones, 2005; Mbaiwa, Stronza, & Kreuter, 2011).

In contrast to the extensive discussion identifying potential marketing supports of CBTE stakeholders and establishing the significance of a collaborative approach, the topic of how stakeholders might collaborate to support CBTEs on issues such as marketing is still under-researched. Exceptionally, few studies emphasise the importance of a partnership-based approach to respond to the marketing challenges of enterprises (Dodds et al., 2016; Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014). At a different scale of the study, few studies assess the ability of a collaborative approach at the operational level of CBTEs to achieve business sustainability. Iorio and Corsale (2014) explore the potential benefits of a network of diverse actors in fostering CBTEs in a village in Romania. The study’s findings imply the importance of the local leader connecting CBTEs with external stakeholders. Tolkach and King (2015), through a case study of Timor-Leste, stress the process of generating a national-level network of CBTEs. These authors argue that a CBT network can support CBTEs in overcoming challenges, including marketing issues. These studies affirm the crucial importance of a CBTE collaborative network and unlock critical factors affecting the successful process of connecting CBTEs and external stakeholders. However, these studies still fail to investigate how such a collaborative network could tackle a particular challenge of CBTEs. This paper adds insights to the discussion of a collaborative approach and CBTEs by including multiple stakeholders engaged in the development of a collaborative marketing approach for the sustainable development of CBTEs.

Table 1. Stakeholders in relationship with a CBTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Potential marketing support</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Private companies | • Include marketing intermediaries who link local entrepreneurs and the market, particularly international markets  
• Provide additional financial support to form co-management partnerships | Snyman (2014); Van Der Duim and Caalders (2008); WTO (2002) |
| NGOs/development agencies/donors | • Provide support for technical training and capacity building  
• Seek to promote fair trade arrangement  
• Facilitate partnerships between CBTEs and other stakeholders | Forstner (2004); Hummel and Van Der Duim (2012); Kennedy and Doman (2009); Zhuang, Lassoie, and Wolf (2011) |
| Community-designated associations | • Assist members with marketing, product development and distribution  
• Offer assistance in legislation, collective bargaining power improvement, training and education, and environmental monitoring through joint effort | Carlisle et al. (2013); Clarke (2004); Tolkach and King (2015) |
| Local authorities/policy-makers | • Facilitate infrastructure improvement  
• Assist in policy frameworks  
• Provide CBTEs with market information | Forstner (2004); Manyara and Jones (2005) |
| Social enterprises | • Function as marketing intermediaries  
• Facilitate knowledge exchange among stakeholders | Von der Weppen and Cochrane (2012); Phi, Whitford, and Dredge, (2016) |
Setting the scene: CBTEs and their sustainable development in Vietnam

Located within the context of a less-developed and communist country, the development of CBTE initiatives in Vietnam is closely aligned with the regulations of the central government and is designed to meet anti-poverty objectives. Specifically, CBTEs are facilitated to address the objective of poverty alleviation that is promoted by the government. In the national socio-economic development strategy for the period 2001–2010, the tourism industry was initially integrated into the national goal of accelerating economic development for poverty reduction (Truong, 2013). This change in the legal environment facilitated the inauguration of CBTE projects in the early 2000s in rural and mountainous regions. A different aspect of the study context recognises that the political economy pertaining to the cumbersome administrative procedures, the corruption, bureaucratisation of officials, and lack of a well-designed rule of law have remarkably characterised CBTE development in Vietnam (Bennett, 2009; ESRT, 2013; Vuong, 2014). The power of the government combined with ineffective performance in CBTE development arguably affects the nature of CBTE collaborative marketing in Vietnam.

CBTE development in Vietnam is also subject to interventions by international development agencies and NGOs. With encouragement from the Vietnamese government, a number of development agencies and NGOs have been allowed to engage in CBTEs for pro-poor objectives. Since the initial CBT project funded by SNV in Sapa in 2001 (Oostveen, Nguyen, & Nguyen, 2003), numerous donor-funded CBTEs have been initiated in various remote regions of Vietnam.

In addition to international donor-funded CBTEs, many self-funded CBTEs, some of which are supported by local NGOs or tour operators, have recently burgeoned in rural regions of Vietnam. General themes of these CBTEs include the initiation of business oriented to the tourism market and the increase in income as a catalyst for social impact (Nguyen, 2016). However, the sustainable development of such CBTEs is currently challenged by a lack of strategic planning and monitoring tools (Khoi, 2017). The shortage of a comprehensive strategy regarding the sustainable development of CBTEs is argued to affect the development of a CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainability in Vietnam.

In contrast to the increasing development of CBTEs in Vietnam, the current literature on the topic is largely scarce and divergent. Most of the knowledge available is interpreted in the “grey” literature (e.g. NGO reports, government documents and local news). However, the press censorship (Cain, 2014) can be an obstacle to the voicing of diverse viewpoints concerning CBTE development through the mass media. Likewise, NGO reports, although neutral from a political perspective, still adhere to their own organisational objectives in their CBTE evaluations (Hummel et al., 2013). Thus, their evaluations may be inconsistent with the viewpoints of other stakeholders. In contrast, the few exceptional academic studies investigating the topic of CBT in Vietnam predominantly prioritise “marginalised” voices (e.g. the community viewpoints) for their investigations (see Le, Weaver, & Lawton, 2012; Tran, 2014; Truong et al., 2014). Thus, there is still a paucity of studies embracing the voices of all the involved stakeholders in assessing the sustainable development of CBTEs in Vietnam. This study aims to bridge this gap by investigating collaborative marketing approaches shaped by diverse stakeholders’ perspectives on ways to achieve the long-term success of CBTEs in Vietnam.

Methodology

Acknowledging diverse viewpoints and their values in understanding a problem, this study adopts a constructivist paradigm in its methodology. Constructivism, according to Guba (1990), admits the multiples of realities that exist in the minds of the “insiders”, and attempts to obtain one or more construction(s) that are reconciled from different perspectives. Due to the nature of the constructivist paradigm, Hollinshead (2006) argues that the paradigm is significant in investigating highly contextualised problem domains in which different worldviews co-exist and might be incongruent with each other.
Informed by a constructivist paradigm of knowledge, this study employs techniques of knowledge co-production. Knowledge co-production is "the collaborative process of bringing a plurality of knowledge sources and types together to address a defined problem and build an integrated or systems-oriented understanding of that problem" (Dale & Armitage, 2011, p. 440). A cornerstone of this approach is the consideration of the viewpoints of all potential stakeholders involved in CBTE collaborative marketing in addressing the research question. Concomitantly, this approach encourages the dialogue between the different viewpoints to achieve a compromise of perspectives and to facilitate social learning. The results presented in this paper represent the first stage of this joint learning process where different perspectives are investigated.

Three CBTEs were chosen for this study: Triem Tay Floating Restaurant in Triem Tay Village (Quang Nam), Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery in Thanh Toan Village (Thua Thien Hue), and Minh Tho Homestay in Mai Hich Village (Hoa Binh). Table 2 presents the background information of the three CBTEs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case study</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triem Tay Floating Restaurant</td>
<td>Triem Tay Village, Quang Nam Province</td>
<td>Was launched in June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 3 km from Hoi An City, a tourist centre</td>
<td>Is owned by a Kinh family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The village has been confronted with the out-migration issues due to land erosion</td>
<td>Received support from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and UNESCO regarding technical training, field trips, marketing and promotion and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Offers food and beverage packages and boating experience</td>
<td>offers Triem Tay’s CBTE co-operative, which was established in September 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is a member of Triem Tay’s CBTE co-operative, which was established in September 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery</td>
<td>Thanh Toan Village, Thua Thien Hue Province</td>
<td>Was established in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 8 km from Hue City, a tourist centre</td>
<td>Is owned by a Kinh family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o The village is renowned for Thanh Toan Tile-Roofed Bridge, a National Heritage Site and a tourist attraction</td>
<td>Used to be under the support of the Japan International Corporation Agency (JICA), SNV, followed by ILO and UNESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Includes gardening experience and cooking classes in its services</td>
<td>Currently in partnerships with 2–3 tour operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is a member of Thanh Toan’s CBTE co-op</td>
<td>Is a member of Thanh Toan’s CBTE co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Is owned by a Thai family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Initiated in 2011 under the support of COHED</td>
<td>Has recently received marketing support from CBT Travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Offers homestay accommodation and other service packages (trekking, cultural performance, boating and biking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minh Tho Homestay</td>
<td>Mai Hich Village, Hoa Binh Province</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o 5 km from Lac Village – a renowned and arguably unsuccessful CBT destination in Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COHED: Centre for Community Health and Development.

b The Kinh people are the majority ethnic group of Vietnam.
c The CBTE co-operative is a form of community alliances that specialises in tourism. This co-op is a community institution consisting of CBTEs as members and acting as a representative of the member entrepreneurs. Usually, a committee of selected members is responsible for the management of the co-op. In Vietnam, CBTE co-ops, similar to other communal cooperatives, are legally integrated into the over-arching Vietnam Cooperative Alliance, a non-profit organisation whose purpose is to support members through consulting, training, and providing a voice for policy change.
d The Thai people are one of the minority ethnic groups of Vietnam.
e CBT Travel is a travel agency specialising in CBT products and services in Vietnam, self-labelled as a social enterprise. It initiates the CBT approach "franchised CBT". Under this approach, CBT Travel facilitates a CBT initiative (mostly a homestay) equipped with standard facilities and services to fulfill travellers’ needs. The project is then handed over to local entrepreneurs through franchising partnerships in which CBT Travel takes in charge of sales, marketing and service quality control for the project. At the time of investigation, CBT Travel supported Minh Tho homestay in sales and marketing (see more in Phi et al., 2016).
from the travellers visiting Thanh Toan Tile-Roofed Bridge and disseminates the tourism benefits to locals. Likewise, the Minh Tho Homestay is among the CBTEs in the region dedicated to the objectives of sustainable poverty alleviation (i.e. increasing tourism-sourced income for the poor in conjunction with minimising the adverse impacts of tourism). All these CBTEs are located in rural and mountainous regions of Vietnam where agriculture is the main source of income. Tourism development in these areas is aimed at diversifying the livelihood options for the local community. With respect to marketing strategies, the Triem Tay Floating Restaurant seeks marketing assistance from the co-ops with extensions to the government, local tour operators, and NGOs. Comparatively, the Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery is more independent in sales and marketing. The Minh Tho Homestay outsources its sales and marketing to CBT Travel. The different marketing strategies illustrate different approaches for CBTEs to engage in marketing opportunities in Vietnam.

In all, 30 interviewees were recruited through purposive and snowball sampling methods. First, key participants were identified through purposive sampling (Sekaran, 1992). This technique ensured that relevant participants were selected within a limited time frame and resulted in the selection of 21 participants from the three CBTEs. These participants were chosen because of their ongoing relationships with the proposed CBTEs and were, therefore, able to provide insights into the collaborative marketing of the three case studies. Then, within the catchment areas of the three case studies, through a snowball technique, nine additional participants were recommended by the key participants. The additional participants were recommended because of their experience in the development of CBTEs in Vietnam. Thus, these participants could provide a diversity of viewpoints on the research topic. Table 3 shows a breakdown of the study’s participants by category and case study.

In-depth, semi-structured, face-to-face interviews (Seidman, 2013) were conducted to collect information from the participants. The main objective of the interviews was to understand the participants’ perceptions relating to stakeholder inclusion and to the facilitators of CBTE collaborative marketing as well as participants’ perspectives on the sustainability of CBTEs.

Data collection occurred in Ha Noi, Hoa Binh, Hue, Da Nang, and Quang Nam (Vietnam) from November 2015 to January 2016. Twenty-eight interviews were conducted in Vietnamese, and two interviews were conducted in English. The interview transcripts were transcribed verbatim in the participants’ own language. The data were then collated with the help of NVivo software. By coding the data by different categories, this computerised analysis tool helps researchers identify, index, and retrieve the data for analysis and evaluation more easily. Content analysis and paradigmatic narrative analysis were employed for the data analysis. On the one hand, content analysis is utilised in analysing textual data to generate rational conclusions (Grbich, 2012). In this study, content analysis was employed to identify the overt codes – that is, stakeholder inclusions, central relationships and facilitators in CBTE collaborative marketing. On the other hand, techniques of paradigmatic narrative analysis help themes to become apparent, either implicitly or explicitly, in a story and throughout stories.
(Polkinghorne, 1995). Thus, it is helpful to clarify perspective-related themes in the responses of interview respondents. In particular, paradigmatic narrative analysis helped to identify power sources, legitimacy, and perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and the business sustainability.

**Collaborative marketing approaches for the sustainable development of CBTEs**

**CBTE sustainability: three alternative marketing approaches**

During the interviews, participants classified approaches to CBTE sustainability into three categories: (1) the commercial viability-driven approach, (2) the community development-driven approach, and (3) the balanced approach. Each approach is analysed individually in the subsections below.

**The commercial viability-driven approach**

The commercial viability-driven approach advocates that self-financing is a prerequisite objective of CBTE collaborative marketing to secure CBTE long-term success. Specifically, this approach focuses on the number of customer visits and income increases. NGO3 argued,

> For fund approval, it is required by our head office [oversea] that the project proposal includes a chapter discussing strategies for sustaining the culture and environment in which the project is embedded. However, it is just quixotic. [...] The first thing we need to be concerned about is how to attract more visitors within a predetermined timeframe of the project.

Another participant (TO4) said, “I do not care what CBT means. From the perspective of a tourism business, I only care how to bring profits for local entrepreneurs”.

In turn, commercially viable ventures are seen as empowering the fulfilment of non-financial objectives. Specifically, the threats of fewer visitors and economic loss would force the community to preserve Indigenous culture and trigger the achievement of community development objectives. According to the experience of the same participant TO4,

> They [the locals in Mai Hich village] have to keep [their village] clean as they know they will only have visitors if the village is clean [...] They have to wear traditional clothes, if not, [I] deduct 10,000 dongs$^{1}$ [from the revenue of every guest served by Mai Hich Homestay].

Additionally, the economic incentives from a commercially successful CBTE facilitate a change in the awareness of the locals. The changed awareness encouraged local entrepreneurs to invest their finances to run the CBTEs. The community’s financial investment to CBTEs was considered as a crucial indicator of the business sustainability. Participant TO5 stated,

> As the initial venture [Minh Tho Homestay] was so successful, the locals [in the village and neighbours] invested their money in running similar businesses. Here, it is vital that the locals learned by themselves and changed their awareness positively.

**The community development-driven approach**

At a different scale, the community development-driven approach establishes community resilience and community involvement as priorities in collaborative marketing initiatives. The community’s resilience is reflected in the diverse sources of livelihood of which tourism is one part. It is crucial that the local entrepreneurs acknowledge their traditional sources of income while entering the tourism business. Participant TO1 commented,

> The local community, which is made up of farmers, is the centre of CBT development models. Thus, to develop CBT development models sustainably, the farmers should keep their traditional jobs rather than convert to other jobs [...]. Once the local community appreciates the values of their traditional livelihoods for the society, CBT development models can be sustained.

The community’s resilience is also reflected in the support of Indigenous culture and local traditions against the endogenous culture of visitors. Cultural resilience protects the traditional life of
locals from being degraded by streams of tourists. Additionally, a well-preserved local lifestyle is ultimately the main motivation of CBT tourists. Thus, local entrepreneurs should be aware that preserving their traditions is a sustainable way to develop their tourism business. A tour operator (TO2) stated, “The principle of CBT development is not exploitation. […] It is a kind of slow investment. […] The investment is aimed at remaining the normal life of the locals”.

Additionally, participants emphasised the involvement of the whole community, rather than a few community members, in tourism activities as a way to achieve CBTE sustainability. The community involvement helps to share tourism opportunities equally, empower the community, promote community solidarity and widely deliver the benefits of tourism to the community. Accordingly, those CBTEs in which each community member had a stake were promoted:

Tourism initiatives are based on the community so that anyone should be able to participate, without any [barrier regarding financial] investments … [so that] all community members can benefit from tourism (NGO5).

It was argued that the resilience, solidarity and empowerment of the community would be a prerequisite for the sustainable development of CBTEs. Participant NGO6 stated:

Once the community acknowledges their value, the idea of initiating tourism businesses to improve the income would be sustainable. The community would not exchange the community's values with economic incentives, as they know which one is worthier.

Accordingly, the community-oriented objectives would regulate marketing activities and economic indicators (i.e. product development, visitor numbers, and business profits). Particularly, it was suggested that CBTEs prioritise community values in their marketing strategies to overcome the paradox between “community” concept and “marketing” concept and the dilemma between poor local communities and relatively wealthier travellers. Participant TS1 stated,

[The concept of] community, on one hand, is attractive and easy to market, but, on the other hand, does not fit with the conventional concept of marketing […] If we try to connect poor locals with rich travellers by conventional marketing efforts, there will be a dead end. […] [Because it can] indulge in illusions among the local community […], urbanise the village [Triem Tay Village], and change the village fundamentally.

NGO5 advocated for an adoption of this approach, citing an example of a CBT project in Nam Giang District, Quang Nam Province, which follows the community development-driven approach.

As we offer single-day, packaged tours only, the community is not affected much [by tourists]. Thus, we have run [the CBT project] for three years [and] there are more than 1,000 visitors, nearly 100 tours, but the community values are still well preserved [against the adverse effects of tourism].

The balanced approach

In between the two-ended approaches above is the balanced approach. This approach seeks to balance commercial success with community development objectives in CBTE collaborative marketing instead of considering one objective at the expense of the other. The approach’s advocates believe that this approach would promote more sustainable CBTEs. Sapa, one of the earliest CBT destinations in Vietnam, was used as an example to stress the significance of a balanced approach for long-term CBTE success. According to the participant TO7,

CBT development in Sapa currently […] faces the issue of CBT supply exceeding CBT demand […]. It leads to the break-up of supply-demand relationships and stakeholder partnerships […], which consequently disappoints people [locals and stakeholders], and they now see the CBT in Sapa as ruined.

Thus, participant OS3 ascertained “Whatever you do, the customer’s benefits and the community’s values have to be in parallel. That is the best and most sustainable strategy for any CBTE”.

Although this approach was perceived as ideal, it was also acknowledged as unrealistic, owing to a lack of metrics to gauge the CBTEs’ sustainability. Specifically, all economic and non-economic
attributes are conceived to be important, but how and to what extent these attributes would be weighed are still unanswered. An example of the dilemma raised by this approach relates to the carrying capacity of the CBTEs. Participants agreed that the CBTEs’ carrying capacity should be considered while attempting to attract visitors. However, participants offered no guidance as to how many visitors a CBTE should accommodate or how a CBT destination should reconcile visitors’ experience and socio-cultural and environmental impacts on the destination. Participant TO7 stated,

We should not expect that visitors will flock [to the village] because of many reasons: locals, environment, and visiting travellers do not want to see many crowds. […] Currently, we have signed a contract with a local representative in a village in Ha Giang [Vietnam] to have someone [from the community] take charge of the project. We groped for this strategy ourselves without instructions. Thus, we are not so confident, and I think neither are the NGOs.

**Stakeholders’ inclusion in CBTE collaborative marketing**

Based on the approaches to CBTE sustainability, participants identified multiple stakeholders that need to be included in CBTE collaborative marketing. As participants perceived the CBTEs as incapable of independently undertaking entrepreneurship marketing activities, at least in their early developmental stages, they affirmed the engagement of multiple stakeholders to form a collaborative marketing approach. Accordingly, tour operators, NGOs, development agencies, local authorities, tourism governments, CBTE co-operatives, and local entrepreneurs are included in CBTE collaborative marketing.

Tour operators were perceived as powerful stakeholders in CBTE collaborative marketing. The position of tour operators in CBTE collaborative marketing appears to be derived from their intermediary roles in the CBTE distribution channels, their tourism expertise, and their financial resources. The intermediary position of tour operators is pivotal for the market access of a CBTE. According to participant OS1, tour operators were the only CBTE stakeholders to have access to international markets. On the domestic front, the intermediary role of tour operators was also essential until CBTEs achieve “a smooth operation and they have a steady source of customers” (OS1). Additionally, tour operators take advantage of tourism expertise and marketing experience to elevate the market access capability of the CBTE. TS4, a marketing manager of a tour operator, ascertained that “People know that they [CBTEs] are here [in Bhoong Village, a CBT destination that TS4’s company promotes], basically because of our marketing”. Tour operators are also able to provide some financial investment into the product development of a CBTE to help CBT products become marketable. “The financial shortage of the local entrepreneurs can be subsidised by us, the tour operators, who have advantages in finance and networks” (TO2). Thus, participant Co-op2 argued, “only tour operators can bring guests to us”.

NGOs and development agencies in CBTE collaborative marketing are included because of their reputation, expertise in non-business aspects, and ability to provide financial support. Owing to these resources, NGOs and development agencies are conceived as development partners and community supporters in CBTE development. They offer financial and technical assistance to initiate CBTEs, undertake the training of entrepreneurs for capacity building, and connect CBTEs with other stakeholders. A tour operator (TO3) stated that it is the NGOs and development agencies who “instil expectations [of sales volume and economic benefits from tourism] for the locals”. NGOs and development agencies, particularly those that are internationally recognised, are viewed as significantly regulating the CBTE marketing, as evidenced by participant TS1:

Triem Tay [village] may not have any outstanding [tourism] attractions [that appeal to] travellers. However, with the seal of UNESCO and ILO that are renowned international organisations, this village’s attractions become valuable.

Political power validates the role of governments in CBTE collaborative marketing. Because of their legislative power, local governments are regarded as arbitrators in the collaborative marketing
efforts. In fact, their role in CBTE collaborative marketing is to control the implementation of stakeholder partnerships. Participant DA1 revealed that:

A contract of service between a tour operator and a community or co-op needs to be signed with a signature and seal of the local government. Given that it is only the local government [and neither the tour operator nor the development agency] who can monitor the community or the co-op in the implementation of the contract.

In the political context of Vietnam, a communist country, the relevance of government inclusion in CBTE collaborative marketing is particularly strong. The government has a certain prerogative to supervise business transactions. According to OS1, “In Vietnam, the government is involved in every activity. Particularly, tourism activities usually have to be aligned with the government’s regulations”. One NGO representative stated, “In relationships with local authorities, we need to gain credibility from them […] so that they can trust our approach […] and support us” (NGO5).

CBTE co-operatives’ involvement in CBTE collaborative marketing is justified because of the perceived legitimacy of this stakeholder. Similar to other community-designated cooperatives, CBTE co-operatives are established to support their members in product development, marketing, and gaining a voice in policy changes. Particularly in the context of Vietnam, where most CBTEs are not registered as a business entity because of a reluctance to pay taxes and the micro scale of the operation, a legitimate CBTE co-operative becomes imperative in CBTE collaborative marketing. For example, the CBTE co-operative represents CBTE members in signing formal contracts with other stakeholders.

Apart from the general consensus among participants regarding the inclusion of crucial stakeholders in CBTE collaborative marketing, there was a divergence of perspectives on the proposals for central linkages and facilitators. The following subsection illustrates the different proposals in accordance with the different approaches for CBTE sustainability.

Central linkages and facilitators for CBTE collaborative marketing

Under the commercial viability-driven approach

The partnerships between a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative (optional), and tour operators are deemed to be paramount in CBTE collaborative marketing. Notably, partnerships between the CBTE and tour operators are considered crucial for the successful marketing of the CBTEs. Since tour operators are conduits linking the CBTE and the market, the participants indicated that they play an essential role in securing the CBTE’s commercial viability. The engagement of tour operators in CBTE collaborative marketing ensures that the CBTEs’ services satisfy the quality standards expected by the market. Participant DA1 argued, “The most challenging issue for the community is […] the service quality. When we discuss this topic, the community and tourism corporations are indispensable actors”.

In CBTE–tour operator marketing partnerships, the CBTE co-operatives can play the role of a CBTE representative, and act as a catalyst for the partnership of the CBTE and the tour operators. The involvement of the CBTE cooperative is particularly important in the infant stages of the CBTEs, in which the CBTEs are still vulnerable to the predatory motivations of private partners. The CBTE co-operatives, through their institutional authority and the support of the local authorities, can control the interventions of tour operators in the community. Additionally, the CBTE co-operatives can give infant CBTEs a voice to attract tour operators and help the tour operators become engaged in CBTE marketing. The CBTE co-operatives act as an alliance of CBTEs at a destination and provide tour operators with a variety of CBT products and services offered at the destination. Therefore, the presence of a CBTE co-operative, according to TO1, represents “better cost-cutting of marketing, a stronger voice power delivering from the marginalised community, the facilitation of business partnerships with tour operators until some individual CBTEs can market themselves, and the empowerment of the community”. Furthermore, the CBTE cooperatives convey a sense of community benefits derived from the business activities of the CBTEs, which contributes to attracting a higher standard of corporate social responsibility from tour operators. A tour operator (TO3) stated,
If we [tour operators] see them [CBTEs] included in a community-based model for the community’s benefit [a CBTE co-op for instance], we will put more effort into promoting them as we know the community can obtain benefits [from our endeavour].

Furthermore, CBTE co-operatives act as a tourism benefit distributor. These co-ops are authorised to manage the community funds derived from tourism activities and contributed by CBTE members. These funds are used for the benefit of the community by, for example, “visiting households and organising activities for children” (TO3). The management and distribution of funds are seen as a way to extend tourism’s economic benefits to the whole community rather than to only the tourism entrepreneurs, thereby avoiding conflict between the local tourism entrepreneurs and the wider community. As TO3 noted, “the [community] fund is necessary so that not only tourism entrepreneurs can benefit from tourism activities but also the surrounding community members”.

Accordingly, tour operators are argued to be the most appropriate facilitators of CBTE collaborative marketing. The position designation is aligned with the approach’s crucial attention to the CBTE’s market access. For tour operators committed to this facilitator role, various forms of contractual relationships are proposed. Specifically, tour operators can obtain privileged access to products in return for their commitment. Participant TG1 used the example of Tra Kieu Travel and the CBTEs of My Son Village (Quang Nam),

The CBTEs of My Son Village, represented by the CBTE co-op, signed a three-year-contract with Tra Kieu Travel. Under the contract, Tra Kieu Travel undertook marketing activities for the CBTEs in exchange for the exclusive right to exploit the CBTEs’ products.

**Under the community-driven approach**

Relationships between CBTEs, through a CBTE co-operative and the government, and tour operators are proposed in CBTE collaborative marketing. The involvement of the CBTE co-operatives and the government in the partnerships between the CBTEs and the tour operators allows the economic benefits to be delivered fairly among the CBTEs as well as between them and the wider community. Additionally, this involvement promotes solidarity within the community, which results in the long-term relationships adhered in CBTE collaborative marketing and consequently in the sustainable development of the CBTEs. Participant NGO4 illustrated,

[Direct partnerships] between individual households and travel agencies is all right in [terms of] business perspective. But this is just [...] for the individual scale, not the community scale [...]. In the context of Vietnam, the local government’s involvement in a management board of community [...] helps to obtain economic benefits from tourists and to share them with the locals.

Accordingly, participants commented on the potential of the government in facilitating the CBTE’s marketing collaboration to monitor the private stakeholders’ interventions. NGO4 said, “As an international organisation, we also ask for coordination from the government [...] Of course they are not so proactive in supporting the community, but they can control the travel agencies”. A local authority (LA1) further said, “We are the only stakeholder who can build up vertical and horizontal connections with other governmental organisations for the marketing and promotion of CBTEs”.

CBTE co-operatives are also able to facilitate CBTE collaborative marketing. As distinguished from the optional role of the CBTE co-operatives in the commercial viability-driven approach, the presence of a CBTE co-operative is required under this approach. Since CBTE co-operatives represent the community, their role in facilitating CBTE collaborative marketing is to ensure that adequate attention is paid to the non-economic attributes in the CBTEs’ development.

As the management board of the CBTE co-operatives acknowledges the balance between tourism business and community development, they explain that principle to member CBTEs. [...] They take advantage of community resources to develop tourism activities, which consequently contribute to the community, for instance, in training members and supporting new product development. (NGO5)
**Under the balanced approach**

In conjunction with seeking a balance between the commercial viability and community development objectives in CBTE collaborative marketing, participants proposed the partnership of a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative, a social enterprise, and tour operators. The involvement of social enterprises and CBTE co-operatives is regarded as a way to secure community benefits from tourism activities while at the same time recognising the pivotal role of tour operators in gaining market access.

Using a long-term view, there needs to be an independent facilitator connecting the CBTEs and tour operators. [...] Such an independent facilitator can be a not-for-profit business or a social enterprise in which the community orientation is prioritised. (DA2)

The role of social enterprises as an independent facilitator in CBTE collaborative marketing was then suggested. Social enterprises possess certain features characterising them as an independent stakeholder in CBTE collaborative marketing. With their not-for-profit status, social enterprises can build non-business relationships with a CBTE, especially in community training and technical support. In this way, social enterprises probably obtain approval from the CBTE to be a CBTE representative. The manager of a self-defined social enterprise (NGO7) contended,

> We define ourselves as an NGO while working with local stakeholders [...]. As an NGO, we aim to support minority groups, traditional artists and the disabled by increasing their income. Concomitantly, we focus on preserving traditional handicrafts and raising local and international awareness about traditional crafts and the culture of minority groups in Vietnam.

A concurrent possibility for social enterprises is to act as business entities in relationships with other stakeholders. Particularly in partnership with tour operators, social enterprises can be travel agencies or destination management companies. A tour operator noted, “We need an expert [at the destination] developing [CBT] products and delivering them to us” (TO3). Specifically, social enterprises were proposed to bridge the gap between infant CBTEs and the market through service quality management and networking, thereby contributing to a collaborative marketing approach for CBTE sustainability.

> Marketing should be based on [service] quality. Once the service quality management certified by international standards is credited, it will fundamentally improve [the CBTE’s strategic] marketing, and contribute to building a destination brand and attracting visitors. (DA2)

These dual attributes lead to the proposed facilitator role for social enterprises in CBTE collaborative marketing. However, the feasibility of this proposal raises concerns. The socio-economic conditions of a less developed country, Vietnam for instance, hinder the feasibility of the proposal. NGO4 commented, “In Vietnam, this type of this organisation does not exist [...] [because] they have no budget for this”. A lack of policy challenges the transformation of the social enterprise concept into practice. Participant NGO7 stated,

> Our organisation works for non-profit objectives and supports the most disadvantaged groups [women and disabled artists of minority ethnic groups] in the society [...]. However, we have confronted many challenges because we are not labelled a social enterprise [...]. We had to register two separate operational entities [i.e. NGO and trader] because there was no social enterprise law. Last November [11/2015], a term specifying social enterprises was finally added to the entrepreneurship law.

Additionally, there is a vague issue about the codes of conduct regulating the relationships between social enterprises and other stakeholders. Participant OS3 questioned, “What are their benefits [of being a facilitator for CBTE collaborative marketing]? [...] This is indeed a challenge as they always have to think how to balance community benefits and economic benefits”.

**Discussion**

Power sources and perceptions of legitimacy arguably regulate stakeholder inclusion in CBTE collaborative marketing. The relationship-related attributes of stakeholders are thoroughly discussed in the
debate concerning inter-organisational collaboration (Beritelli & Laesser, 2011; Jamal & Stronza, 2009). Indeed, the attributes of power and legitimacy have been consistently utilised in assessing stakeholder inclusion in any collaboration (Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997). This study adds insights to this discussion through the lens of CBTE collaborative marketing and within the context of a communist country. Particularly, in the study context of Vietnam, a communist country in which the central state still controls the nation’s tourism industry (Michaud & Turner, 2017), political powers are stressed in defining stakeholder inclusion in CBTE collaborative marketing. The inclusion of the government stakeholders in CBTE collaborative marketing and their proposed role of collaboration facilitator under the community development-driven approach illustrate this argument. Additionally, the stakeholder’s legitimacy is initially and mainly perceived concerning their legal authority. The legal status of CBTE co-operatives means they are perceived as being capable of representing the community, while the lack of legal status of social enterprises causes a reluctance regarding the feasible operations of social enterprises in CBTE collaborative marketing.

The linkage between marketing and CBTE sustainability is assessed in this study. On the one hand, this study argues for the potential of marketing to influence the achievement of CBTE sustainability (Gilmore et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2010; Pomering et al., 2011). The inclusion of social enterprises and co-operatives in the balanced CBTE collaborative marketing approach exemplifies the argument. The importance of social enterprises in delivering community-based development and sustainability outcomes has been highlighted previously (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). In this study, social enterprises were promoted for the role of facilitators who focus on marketing co-efforts to enable greater sustainable outcomes for CBTEs. Likewise, in CBTE collaborative marketing, CBTE cooperatives acted as the representatives of local entrepreneurs where legal authority was needed, the mediators connecting CBTEs and private corporations, and impartial distributors of tourism benefits to the wider community. The inclusion of CBTE co-operatives in CBTE collaborative marketing can be considered a response to the need for community institutions, which are crucial for the long-term development of CBTEs (Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan, & Luloff, 2010; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Tolkach & King, 2015). Accordingly, in the balanced approach, a sustainability-oriented marketing viewpoint prevails. On the other hand, the study reveals the conventional perception of CBTE stakeholders on marketing as an economic tool (Lane, 1994). The two-ended approaches for the sustainable development of CBTEs, as assessed in this study, illustrate the insight. In the study, the advocates of the commercial viability-driven approach argued for a demand-oriented marketing viewpoint. The demand-oriented marketing viewpoint defines the linkages between a CBTE and tour operators at the heart of CBTE collaborative marketing. In contrast, the supporters of the community development-driven approach argued for a supply-oriented marketing viewpoint in CBTE collaborative marketing. The supply-oriented marketing viewpoint was reflected through the government’s role as a convenor to mitigate the adverse impacts of CBTE–tour operator linkages that hinder the attainment of community development objectives. The marketing perception as a conventional economic tool, which is the enemy of non-economic objectives, cannot result in the CBTE sustainability. The stories of poor marketed CBTEs and unsustainably commercialised CBTEs in less developed countries concur with this argument.

There is a knowledge gap that emerged from this study. The gap in the realm of tourism sustainability has consistently risen (Ceron & Dubois, 2003; Ruhanen, 2008; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). In this study, the gap was illustrated by the lack of metrics that caused the impracticability of the balanced approach for a better CBTE sustainability. In contrast to extensive academic studies arguing for a holistic set of sustainability indicators for CBTEs (Choi & Sirakaya, 2006; Lemelin et al., 2015; Roberts & Tribe, 2008), practitioners in the social world, as shown in this study, still experience a lack of appropriate knowledge needed to guide their activities. The gap was also reflected in the perspectives on the attributes of sustainable CBTEs. Theoretically, the attributes of commercial viability and community development are different dimensions of CBTE sustainability, and for the most part, do not conflict (Carr et al., 2016; Dangi & Jamal, 2016). However, the divergence of the two marketing approaches for CBTE sustainability, i.e. commercial viability-driven and community
development-driven approaches, as illustrated in this study, explained the CBTE stakeholders’ perspectives on the attributes of CBTE sustainability. Indeed, CBTE stakeholders in this study perceived the objectives of commercial viability and community development in a superior–inferior relationship, in which one attribute takes precedence over the other. Thus, this study implies that academic knowledge of CBTE sustainability developed through Indigenous tourism research does not correspond to the perspectives of practitioners.

There are also divergent perspectives among CBTE stakeholders on the issues involved in CBTE collaborative marketing. First, the perspectives on marketing and CBTE sustainability varied by different categories of stakeholders. Indeed, the inconsistencies in perspectives among the stakeholders and their impacts on collaborative efforts have been discussed in the literature of CBT (Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2014; Taylor, 2016). In this study, tour operators insisted on the commercial viability-driven marketing approach and added some embryonic ideas about the relevance of the balanced approach. The government perceived the topic of CBTE marketing and sustainability under either the commercial viability-driven approach or the community development approach without any acknowledgement of the balanced approach. At a different scale, the perceptions of NGOs and development agencies regarding CBTE marketing and sustainability stretched over the three approaches. Interestingly, perceptions on CBTE marketing and sustainability from entrepreneurs and co-operatives were limited to their stories of daily operational issues and economic incentives. Second, there was controversy pertaining to the government’s intervention level in CBTE collaborative marketing. Numerous studies argue that the government involvement in CBT development is significant (Kontogeorgopoulos et al., 2014; Truong, 2013; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). Although the government’s intervention in CBTE collaborative marketing was affirmed as necessary in this study, there was a controversy regarding how extensive the intervention should be. The intervention ranged from the role of an arbitrator in the commercial viability-driven approach to a more engaged role as a facilitator in the community development-driven approach. Third, the governance of social enterprises as a facilitator of CBTE collaborative marketing was vague. With regard to CBT development, social enterprises can be market intermediaries (Von Der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012), and knowledge brokers (Phi et al., 2017). This study arguably advocates for the facilitator role of social enterprises in CBTE collaborative marketing. Nevertheless, it reveals vagueness in the governance of social enterprises to fit the proposed role. Among the investigated NGOs and development agencies, some viewpoints proposed a revolution of social enterprises from local NGOs whereas the others doubted about the proposal’s feasibility due to financial difficulties. Likewise, the self-transformation of tour operators to social entrepreneurship received concerns from other tour operators and the community supporters regarding the potential benefit conflicts adhered to this proposed governance.

**Conclusion**

This study investigates stakeholder engagement in CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability. Specifically, collaborative marketing approaches that include crucial stakeholders (tour operators, NGOs, development agencies, the government, local entrepreneurs, and CBTE co-operatives) are advocated. Indeed, three CBTE collaborative marketing approaches are identified and are differentiated regarding the pathways to CBTE sustainability, the perceptions of CBTE marketing, the identification of central linkages in CBTE collaborative networks, and the proposals of collaboration facilitator. The findings from this study also reveal that a CBTE collaborative marketing approach in which the objectives of commercial viability and community development are balanced can lead to the better sustainability of CBTEs. Under this approach, marketing is employed as not a conventional economic tool but a strategic mechanism to achieve the CBTE sustainability. However, for a successful integration of collaborative marketing and CBTE sustainability, there is a need to bridge the theory–practice gap and to reconcile divergent perspectives among CBTE stakeholders. Therefore, this study argues for the significance of a knowledge co-production approach in which researchers and
CBTE stakeholders work together to develop a collaborative marketing approach for the CBTE long-term success.

This study has certain limitations. This study ignores the business life cycle of CBTE development, which may affect perspectives relating to central linkages and facilitators of CBTE collaborative marketing. For instance, the role of a collaboration facilitator may differ for mature CBTEs compared to infant ones. Furthermore, the investigation of CBTEs in Vietnam may not reflect the diverse collaborative marketing alternatives of CBTEs in other parts of the world.

Implications for future research are presented. Particularly, a participatory research approach should be adopted to investigate the process of knowledge co-production between the researchers and CBTE stakeholders and among the CBTE stakeholders regarding CBTE collaborative marketing. In fact, the results of this study represent the first stage of the knowledge co-production process through which diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing are explored. Following this first stage, possible future research on this topic could include facilitating a platform for knowledge interactions between the researchers and CBTE stakeholders to achieve a compromise of perspectives. A feedback mechanism to evaluate the learning outcomes associated with the knowledge co-production process should be included. Additionally, a comparative study of CBTE collaborative marketing in different political economy contexts is necessary. The investigation would help to specify the typical stakeholder engagement in the development of CBTEs in less-developed communist countries.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the contributions of research participants to this paper.

Note

1. Equivalent to US$0.50.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes on contributors

Tramy Ngo is a PhD candidate and HDR member of Griffith Institute for Tourism, Griffith University, Australia. She has worked as a tourism lecturer, project coordinator, and researcher in Vietnam. Her research interests include sustainable tourism, sustainable tourism marketing, community-based tourism, and knowledge co-production approach in tourism.

Dr Gui Lohmann is associate professor in Air Transport and Tourism and also a member of the Griffith Institute for Tourism (GIFT) (Australia). He has authored several books, including “Tourism theories: concepts, models and systems” published by CAB International, and peer-reviewed journal articles in English, Spanish and Portuguese on transport and tourism-related topics. He has worked as a consultant for the Brazilian Ministry of Tourism, the World Tourism Organization and the United Nations Environmental Program, in addition to providing consulting to Adelaide Airport, Brisbane Airport Corporation and Queensland Airport Ltd.

Dr Rob Hales is the Program Director of the Griffith Centre for Sustainable Enterprise and lectures in the Department of Tourism, Sport and Hotel Management at Griffith University, Australia. His research interests include climate change, sustainable tourism, social movement studies, Indigenous studies, adventure tourism and outdoor recreation.

ORCID

Gui Lohmann http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3374-9734
References


-103-


5.1. Introduction

Findings from Chapter 4 indicated that stakeholder perspectives on how to marketing a CBTE to achieve long-term success are diverse in two aspects. First, three alternatives to a CBTE collaborative marketing approach were identified. Two approaches, namely commercial viability-driven marketing and community development-driven marketing approaches, were in opposition in a spectrum and a balanced approach was in the middle of the spectrum. Each two-ended approaches had advantages and drawbacks, whereas the balanced approach was perceived as better promoting CBTE business sustainability but less realistic. These CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives reflect the ideological challenges associated with CBTE collaborative marketing (i.e., neoliberalism versus protectionism, and post-colonialism versus decolonialism). Second, CBTE stakeholders contradicted each other on marketing objectives towards CBTE business sustainability, government intervention levels in CBTE collaborative marketing, and the vague governance of social enterprises as a facilitator of CBTE collaborative marketing. The stakeholder perspectives varied across different stakeholder categories (i.e., tourism corporations, governments, local communities, NGOs, co-operatives). This divergence arguably affects the collaborative process of those stakeholders to address the marketing challenges of CBTEs and booster the business sustainability. To this end, it is necessary to have stakeholder perspectives reconciled to secure successful collaborations and effective relationships in a CBTE collaborative marketing network. An outcome of the reconciliation process is a framework underpinning stakeholder interventions in CBTE marketing co-efforts. However, as indicated in Chapter 2, the topics relating to the processes of reconciling diverse perspectives among CBTE stakeholders and a framework guiding stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs to attain business sustainability have not been adequately examined in the CBT literature. It was also indicated in Chapter 2 the potential of the knowledge co-
production approach to regulate the reconciliation process of diverse viewpoints in collaborative works.

Accordingly, the present chapter aims to investigate the process of reconciling diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing using the knowledge co-production approach (RO2), and consequently, identifies a framework that guides stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs to attain long-term success (RO3). To support the investigation undertaken in this chapter, the research methodology presented in Chapter 3 is utilised.
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ABSTRACT
Collaborative marketing for the sustainable development of community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) is subject to diverse stakeholder perspectives and a complex mix of factors determining collaboration success. This research investigates a framework supporting stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs for sustainable development. The proposed framework is an outcome of the process of reconciling divergent perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing using a knowledge co-production approach. Particularly, knowledge interactions between researchers and research participants to achieve a synthesis of perspectives in developing a collaborative marketing approach for the sustainable development of CBTEs in Vietnam were investigated. The knowledge interaction occurred in the form of a workshop that included 15 CBTE stakeholders and the first author and was undertaken in the village of Triem Tay (Vietnam). Through the workshop, a collaborative marketing framework for CBTE sustainability was identified. The framework stated the reasons for the divergence of perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development: limited understanding of involved stakeholders; individuality in collective efforts; stakeholder self-righteousness; and contextual factors. Accordingly, the framework identified four attributes supporting stakeholders collaborations in marketing CBTEs for sustainable development: improved and right-directed perspectives of CBTE stakeholders; a set of rules governing stakeholder interventions; government involvement in CBTE collaborative marketing in the roles of an inspirer and an arbitrator; and the transformation from successful tour operators to social entrepreneurship to facilitate CBTE collaborative marketing. The contribution of this study lies in the potential of a knowledge co-production approach to be utilised in collaborative works involving multiple perspectives. Additionally, the study provides insights into the discussion of community-based tourism collaboration.
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Introduction
Marketing is a crucial business activity for the successful development of community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) that involves the cooperation of multiple stakeholders (Dixey, 2008; Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2017; Manyara & Jones, 2007). A CBTE, as an economic-based and entrepreneurship-oriented initiative, is frequently considered for the purpose of fostering sustainable development. According to Spenceley (2008), three criteria define a CBTE: local community ownership of the business; full
community involvement in the business operation; and the community as the main beneficiary from the business. Owing to these attributes, CBTEs are potential to transform tourism opportunities at the grassroots level and to distribute tourism benefits to the wider community; thereby contributing to sustainable development within a tourism destination (Simpson, 2008; Von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012). Regardless, only a few CBTEs can claim success (Goodwin & Santilli, 2009; Rocharungsat, 2008). Indeed, marketing-related issues have been identified as the cause of business failure amongst CBTEs (Dixey, 2008; Mielke, 2012). In response, linkages with external stakeholders have been used to help CBTEs overcome their marketing challenges and, consequently, to attain long-term success (Dixey, 2008; Mbaiva, Stronza, & Kreuter, 2011). Accordingly, a collaborative marketing approach is needed to support stakeholder collaborations oriented towards the sustainable development of CBTEs.

From an epistemological point of view, CBTE collaborative marketing for business sustainability is a knowledge domain where the viewpoints of researchers, practitioners, external stakeholders, and internal stakeholders can diverge. The acknowledgement of diverse viewpoints is essential to addressing problems more effectively, integrating different sources of knowledge, bridging the research-practice gap, bolstering social justice, and promoting decolonisation in knowledge generation (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Dredge, Hales, & Jamal, 2013; Dredge & Jamal, 2015; Platenkamp, 2007). However, as multiple viewpoints are parts of different epistemologies, they might become incongruent (Higgins-Desbiolles, Trevorrow, & Sparrow, 2014; Taylor, 2016). The incongruence of perspectives arguably results in a disparity of problem-solving approaches, the disruption of stakeholder relationships, and research-practice gaps (Ruhanen, 2008; Taylor, 2016). Thus, in collaborative research involving dissimilar viewpoints, conflicting perspectives can affect the process of integrating diverse viewpoints. In this regards, a knowledge co-production approach is deemed to be capable of reconciling polarised perspectives. Indeed, the potential of a knowledge co-production approach as a research methodology in collaborative research has been recognised (Carr, Ruhanen, & Whitford, 2016; Dredge & Jamal, 2015; Font & McCabe, 2017). However, the wealth of knowledge from knowledge co-production studies is still minimal.

Thus, the purpose of this paper is to employ a knowledge co-production approach to reconcile divergent perspectives, thereby proposing a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs. A case study in Vietnam has been used. To this end, this paper’s objectives are twofold: (1) interrogate the significance of a knowledge co-production approach to reconcile diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development; and as an outcome of the reconciliation process, (2) identify the attributes of a proposed collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs. The contribution of this study lies in the potential of a knowledge co-production approach to be utilised in collaborative works involving multiple perspectives. Additionally, the study provides insights into the discussion of community-based tourism collaboration.

Accordingly, this paper is structured in six sections. Apart from this Introduction section, a Literature Review section is provided in order to interrogate the current body of literature on diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing. This section also reviews the potential of knowledge interactions grounded on a knowledge co-production approach for achieving cognitive consensus among different viewpoints. In the Methodology section, the research paradigm and the methodological approaches are presented. Then, the attributes of a collaborative marketing framework for CBTE sustainability are illustrated. This framework exemplifies the outcome of the process of reconciling perspectives between embodied researchers and CBTE stakeholders. The Discussion section follows in which the paper’s contributions to tourism knowledge are argued. Finally, in the Conclusion section, the paper’s limitations and implications for future research are stated.

**Literature review**

*Collaborative marketing and the sustainable development of CBTEs*

A multiple stakeholder approach to CBTE marketing is resounded as one of the management tools to promote CBTE sustainable development (Asker, Boronyak, Carrard, & Paddon, 2010;
For a CBTE to obtain sustainable development, dual objectives of commercial viability and community developed need to be balanced (Carr et al., 2016; Lemelin, Koster, & Youroukos, 2015; Manyara & Jones, 2005). The involvement of multiple stakeholders rather than dyadic relationships is argued to better balance the dichotomous objectives of CBTE sustainability. For instance, dyadic relationships between a CBTE and a private corporation through a joint venture are capable of leveraging for a CBTE’s commercial viability, but cast doubt of their potential contributions to the CBTE’s community wellbeing objectives (Manyara & Jones, 2005). Another example of dyadic relationship is the sponsorship of a non-governmental organisation (NGO) to a CBTE for the purpose of community empowerment, which might result in a deficient consideration to market-ready products (Mielke, 2012; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011). To this end, a collaborative marketing approach involving a wider range of stakeholders is advocated to promote the long-term success of CBTEs (Asker et al., 2010; Carlisle, Kunc, Jones, & Tiffin, 2013).

CBTE collaborative marketing refers to the involvement of stakeholders on the basis of their marketing resources, working with other stakeholders and with CBTEs to assist CBTEs in achieving their marketing objectives. At the centre of CBTE collaborative marketing is the involvements of CBTE stakeholders. Accordingly, there have been numerous studies identifying potential stakeholders who can assist CBTEs in marketing and promotion. In particular, CBTE marketing stakeholders include tour operators, NGOs, development agencies, community-designated associations, local authorities, policy makers, and social institutions (Carlisle et al., 2013; Forstner, 2004; Ngo, Lohmann, & Hales, in press; Tolkach & King, 2015; Von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012).

However, research addressing the domain of stakeholder collaborations in CBTE marketing is still scarce. Among the few exceptions, the marketing significance of stakeholders towards the development of a CBTE is adequately researched (Carlisle et al., 2013; Forstner, 2004; Lynch, Duinker, Sheehan, & Chute, 2011; Tolkach & King, 2015; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008; Williams & Richter, 2002). Lesser attention has been paid to the collaboration process among stakeholders to marketing CBTEs for sustainable development. In particular, there is a paucity of research investigating guidance for stakeholder involvements in CBTE collaborative marketing. Such the research is particularly worth. For instance, the guidance acknowledged by involved stakeholders can promote successful and long-term marketing partnerships among stakeholders as well as between stakeholders and a CBTE. Concomitantly, the guidance framed by the objectives of CBTE sustainability can drive stakeholder involvements oriented towards the sustainable development of CBTEs. Considering the expected significance and the above-mentioned knowledge gap in the CBTE collaborative marketing literature, this research attempts to propose a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs.

**Conflicting perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing**

The development of a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs confronts divergent perspectives. CBTE collaborative marketing involves multiple stakeholders with different perspectives (Higgins-Desbiolles et al., 2014; Taylor, 2016). The contrasting viewpoints of CBTE marketing are broadly classified into two dichotomous categories i.e. supply-oriented marketing and market-driven marketing approaches (Ngo et al., in press). The polarity between these categories primarily involves prioritising either the objectives supporting community development or the attributes of commercial viability in pathways to realising sustainable CBTEs.

For those stakeholders who view CBTE marketing as regulated by the CBTE’s community development objectives, a supply-oriented marketing approach is advocated. This type of marketing approach is characterised by its prioritisation of non-monetised objectives, community inward-orientation, and the minimisation of adverse tourism impacts (Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Theerapappisit, 2009). In this approach, marketing strategies of a CBTE both initially and ultimately emphasise tourism opportunities for non-economic objectives (such as preserving the culture and the environment, fostering community learning and empowerment, promoting gender equality and community
solidarity, and educating young generations) rather than for economic benefits. Accordingly, linkages between a CBTE, community associations, and the government are centralised in a CBTE marketing network (Ngo et al., in press). However, a supply-oriented marketing approach involves certain challenges. For instance, the hesitation in establishing committed linkages with tour operators due to the threat associated with the predatory motives of private partners can threaten the market appeal of CBTEs (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012). Additional, a supply-oriented marketing approach prioritising non-economic objectives might be a disincentive for local communities’ engagement and long-term support. Given that local communities welcome tourism because it is perceived as a source of income, and the immediate concern of local communities is the economic benefits of tourism (Novelli & Gebhardt, 2007; Truong, Hall, & Garry, 2014). Because of these challenges, the workability of this marketing approach arouses scepticism. Indeed, the numerous CBTEs in less-developed countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia that have collapsed because of their poor preparation of market-ready products (Dodds et al., 2017; Mielke, 2012) arguably offer evidence to oppose this approach.

In contrast, there are some stakeholders who regard marketing as the main mechanism for improving the economic viability of CBTEs. From this perspective, CBTE marketing can serve as a tool to successfully optimise the economic tourism benefits yielded by a CBTE, which in turn leverages non-economic benefits for a destination community (Dodds et al., 2017; Lucchetti & Font, 2013). Accordingly, linkages between a CBTE and a private partner are promoted through the demand-driven marketing approach, most notably joint venturing partnerships (Ngo et al., in press; Salole, 2007; Snyman, 2012; Torres, Skillcorn, & Nelson, 2011). However, concerns embedded with this marketing approach (e.g. unsustainable livelihood transformation, and political and economic post-colonisation within a community) might hinder the long-term success of CBTEs (Koot, 2016; Taylor, 2016).

Thus, we argue that reconciling these divergent marketing perspectives is necessary when developing a collaborative marketing approach for better sustainability of CBTEs. Such reconciliation will help CBTE marketing in a manner that reduces the opportunity costs incurred in a community’s engagement in tourism business activities. Concomitantly, the reconciliation improves the commercial appeal of CBTEs, thereby fostering the businesses’ long-term success (Armstrong, 2012; Nelson, 2008).

Investigating a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs also confronts the knowledge gap between researchers and practitioners. A collaborative marketing framework generated by practitioners is presumably rich in the characteristics of contextualisation, as well as in problem-specific and problem-solving functions (Hessels & Van Lente, 2008; Tribe & Liburd, 2016). However, some drawbacks of this practitioner-driven-knowledge include ignoring complexities and unforeseen consequences and the presence of contextualisation-based bias (Barnes, 2014; Tribe & Liburd, 2016). Likewise, due to the pressure on academics to publish in peer-reviewed journals, a collaborative marketing framework predominantly generated by academic scholars might be criticised regarding its low readability rate, low relevance to community needs, and inability to solve societal problems (Dredge et al., 2013; Ruhanen, 2008). Thus, reconciling diverse perspectives between researchers and practitioners (i.e. CBTE stakeholders) is essential. Such perspective integration would minimise the boundaries of the researchers’ and practitioners’ worlds in CBTE development.

Developing a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs will be possible and useful if it is conducted within a knowledge co-production framework. Specifically, the abovementioned incongruence can be reconciled if knowledge interactions in a knowledge co-production study are facilitated, thereby contributing to the sustainability of CBTEs.

Knowledge co-production, knowledge interactions, and the potential to reconcile divergent perspectives

The knowledge co-production approach is “the collaborative process of bringing a plurality of knowledge sources and types together to address a defined problem and build an integrated or systems-
oriented understanding of that problem” (Armitage, Berkes, Dale, Kocho-Schellenberg, & Patton, 2011, p. 996). In a knowledge co-production approach, various knowledge types are derived from different epistemologies and standpoints. Scientists, governmental authorities, NGOs, entrepreneurs, and others differ in their perspectives because of the different epistemologies of their worlds (Hegger, Lamers, Van Zeijl-Rozema, & Dieperink, 2012). Given the differences in various perspectives, each perspective holder is regarded as a co-producer of knowledge generated at an intersphere of various viewpoint boundaries (Berkes, 2009). As a research methodology, a knowledge co-production study is collaborative work between researchers and research participants through which the viewpoints of both researchers and research participants are acknowledged and appreciated (Davidson-Hunt & Michael O’Flaherty, 2007; Dredge et al., 2013). Accordingly, both researchers representing scientific perspectives and research participants possessing social viewpoints are participants in the knowledge generation process. They become knowledge co-generators and co-researchers. They shape the research direction, engage in the research process stages and regulate the research outcomes (Castleden, Morgan, & Lamb, 2012).

Knowledge interactions are central to a knowledge co-production study. As argued by Davidson-Hunt and Michael O’Flaherty (2007), indigenous research studies need to facilitate dialogues between science-based researchers and indigenous people about their perspectives on the studied phenomena. Such knowledge dialogues are not a one-way communication of understanding and articulating voices of the marginalised in the research process. Instead, they are interactive and dialectic conversations between researchers and research participants. Knowledge interaction occurs in an “agora”, which is an intersection area for negotiations between different perspectives (Nowotny, 2003). The agora, according to Cornwall (2004, p. 75), is “bounded” beyond the academic arena and the social realm, “yet permeable” so that representatives of different perspectives can assemble for knowledge sharing. Through knowledge interactions, different perspectives are negotiated and shared (Nowotny, 2003; Cornwall, 2004).

In the tourism literature, there is a paucity of research evaluating the significance of knowledge interactions among knowledge-holders with different viewpoints. The studies of Espeso-Molinero, Carlisle, and Pastor-Alfonso (2016) and Becken, Zammit, and Hendrikx (2015) are among the few to investigate knowledge dialogues between researchers and practitioners. Espeso-Molinero et al. (2016) focus on the outcomes of knowledge dialogues between indigenous entrepreneurs and university researchers in Mexico, including the development of cultural-rich tourism products and the empowerment of indigenous entrepreneurs. Becken et al. (2015) discuss the interactions between tourism stakeholders in Queenstown, New Zealand, and researchers regarding the project of climate change maps designed for the tourism sector. According to these authors, these interactions raised awareness for involved stakeholders and enhanced the practicability of the project. The studies stressed the significance of knowledge co-production in taking advantage of multiple sources of knowledge in collaborative works. The present study contributes to the discussion on the knowledge co-production approach by interrogating its potential to reconcile diverse perspectives in collaborative works. In doing so, we use a case study of researchers and CBTE stakeholders working together to develop a collaborative marketing approach for the sustainable development of CBTEs in Vietnam. Through this case study, we argue that knowledge interactions in a knowledge co-production study can facilitate the achievement of a synthesis of perspectives.

**Methodology**

**The methodological approach**

To investigate the significance of a knowledge co-production approach in reconciling diverse perspectives, thereby proposing a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs, this study adopts a constructivist qualitative research design. A constructivist paradigm is employed to validate the appreciation of different viewpoints in knowledge generation. According to
(Guba, 1990), a constructivist paradigm acknowledges the co-existence of multiple realities in people’s minds, and attempts to obtain one or few construction(s) that are reconciled from different perspectives. Indeed, a constructivist approach has been widely applied in tourism research to investigate highly contextualised problem domains, in which multiple viewpoints co-exist and are potentially incongruent with each other (Hollinshead, 2006).

Based on a constructivist qualitative research paradigm, this research is theoretically situated in the stakeholder collaboration process which was initiated by Gray (1989), lately illustrated by Jamal and Getz (1995), and is presented in Table 1.

In particular, this research aims to address stakeholder concerns in Stage I of the collaboration process and consequently determine an agreed collaborative marketing framework for CBTE sustainable development in Stage II. Methodologically, cognitive consensus building, which was proposed by Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), is employed. Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), in the context of group decision-making in organisations, define cognitive consensus as “similarity among group members regarding how issues are defined and conceptualised” (p. 311). According to Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), a cognitive consensus-building process, through the interactions of the involved participants with different viewpoints, can achieve a wide range of outcomes from shared assumptions underlying problems, shared interpretations of issues, and shared agreements on decisions. Within the scope of this study, the notion of cognitive consensus building is utilised to frame the process of addressing the conflicting perspectives of a collaborative marketing approach for the sustainable development of CBTEs. As an outcome of the consensus building process, a shared understanding about CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development is achieved, which is exemplified through a proposed CBTE collaborative marketing framework. Figure 1 provides a visual presentation of the research’s framework.

**The method**

**Constructing the research sample**

As part of a knowledge co-production study, this paper reports on the outcomes of the second stage (Stage 2) of a two-stage research project. In Stage 1, the project explored perspectives on CBTE sustainable development in Stage II. Methodologically, cognitive consensus building, which was proposed by Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), is employed. Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), in the context of group decision-making in organisations, define cognitive consensus as “similarity among group members regarding how issues are defined and conceptualised” (p. 311). According to Mohammed and Ringseis (2001), a cognitive consensus-building process, through the interactions of the involved participants with different viewpoints, can achieve a wide range of outcomes from shared assumptions underlying problems, shared interpretations of issues, and shared agreements on decisions. Within the scope of this study, the notion of cognitive consensus building is utilised to frame the process of addressing the conflicting perspectives of a collaborative marketing approach for the sustainable development of CBTEs. As an outcome of the consensus building process, a shared understanding about CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development is achieved, which is exemplified through a proposed CBTE collaborative marketing framework. Figure 1 provides a visual presentation of the research’s framework.

**Table 1. Three-stage collaboration process of Gray (1989), advanced by Jamal and Getz (1995).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Actions/Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Stage I: Problem-setting** | Define purpose and domain  
Identify convener  
Convene stakeholder  
Define problems/issues to resolve  
Identify and legitimize stakeholders  
Build commitment to collaborate by raising awareness of interdependence  
Balance power differences  
Address stakeholder concerns  
Ensure adequate resources to allow collaborations to proceed with key stakeholders present |
| **Stage II: Direction-setting** | Collect and share information  
Appreciate shared values, enhance perceived interdependencies  
Ensure power distribution among several stakeholders  
Establish rules and agenda for direction-setting  
Organise sub-groups if required  
List alternatives  
Discuss various options  
Select appropriate solutions  
Arrive at shared visions or plans/strategies through consensus |
| **Stage III: Implementation** | Discuss means of implementing and monitoring solutions, shared visions, plans or strategies  
Select a suitable structure for the institutionalising process  
Assign goals and tasks  
Monitor on-going progress and ensure compliance with collaboration decisions |

Source: (Jamal & Getz, 1995).
collaborative marketing and business sustainability via interviews. Among the outcomes of this stage, divergent perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing emerged (see Table 2) and are a prerequisite for Stage 2 of the project whose outcomes are reported in this paper. Specifically, the present research sought to create a knowledge dialogue between stakeholders of different viewpoints through group discussions, with the expressed purpose of reconciling divergent perspectives. Group discussions were deemed appropriate because they initiate and encourage interactions among participants to generate a consensus on a specific problem (Barbour, 2008). Because of this study’s limited timeframe and budget, the group discussions were conducted in the form of a half-day workshop.

Accordingly, thirty interview participants from three cases studies of Vietnam (i.e. Triem Tay, Thanh Toan and Mai Hich villages) (Stage 1) comprised the sampling pool. The selection of Vietnam as the research context is explained. CBT development in Vietnam is still a blank-dot within the literature of tourism. Among the exceptions, few studies have discussed the linkage of CBT and poverty alleviation in Vietnam (Le, Weaver, & Lawton, 2016; Truong et al., 2014), as well as the legibility of the central government on tourism activities (Michaud & Turner, 2017). Together with those initial attempts, this study aims to add insights to the current wealth of knowledge about stakeholder collaboration and CBT development through the lens from Vietnam, which is a less-developed, Asian, communist country. More specifically, Triem Tay village was selected out of the three case studies to conduct the workshop (Stage 2), based on a purposive sampling method (Sekaran, 1992). Among the thirty interviewees, ten were involved in the case of Triem Tay, the highest proportion compared to eight and seven interviewees in the cases of Thanh Toan and Mai Hich, respectively. This indication tentatively increases the probability of interviewees agreeing to attend the workshop. In addition, Triem Tay is relatively a fledgling regarding the development of CBT. CBT initiatives in this village go back to 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Divergent perspectives in CBTE collaborative marketing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruent perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dichotomy of marketing objectives towards CBTE sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversy about government intervention levels in CBTE collaborative marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagueness and confusion in the governance of social enterprises as a facilitator of CBTE collaborative marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Social enterprises are institutions adopting market-based approaches to achieve social aims (Von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012).
whereas CBT activities in Thanh Toan and Mai Hich were initiated in 2012 and 2011, respectively. Indeed, the infant development of CBTEs arguably exacerbates the marketing challenges that CBTEs need to overcome. Thus, a discussion about marketing for the sustainable tourism of CBTEs in Triem Tay village could better attract the interests of CBTE stakeholders and amplify its practical contributions.

Thus, an invitation to the workshop was sent to the thirty interview participants. Eight respondents responded to the invitation. In light of the group discussion size, the categories of participants, and recommendations by the accepted invitees, three additional invitations were sent to other interested participants. As a result, eleven participants confirmed their attendance. Additionally, four unexpected participants who knew about the workshop from the confirmed participants expressed an interest in attending, and these people were accepted into the workshop. Thus, the total number of workshop participants was 15. Table 3 details information about the workshop participants.

Conducting the workshop
Hosted by the first author, the workshop was organised in the community hall of Triem Tay village (Quang Nam Province) on 17 March 2017. Various interactive activities were conducted consecutively to sustain the participants’ interest in the workshop. In particular, a video briefly describing the interviews’ outcomes and the workshop’s aim was sent to participants two weeks before the workshop. One week after the video was released, an infographic detailing emergent incongruent perspectives in proposed CBTE collaborative marketing alternatives was also sent. The video and infographic were an effective way to deliver interview outcomes to non-academic audiences and highlighted the process of the knowledge co-production study.

At the workshop, the participants took part in guided discussions on three issues: (1) the balance of commercial viability and community development objectives in CBTE collaborative marketing; (2) the extent to which the government should intervene in CBTE collaborative marketing; and (3) the governance of social enterprises in a CBTE collaborative marketing network. In particular, the participants clarified the reasons for the divergent perspectives and proposed resolutions to reconcile conflicts. To organise the discussions, participants were classified into clusters of perspectives (see Table 2). Three concurrent group discussions (tourism business, government and community-related groups) were conducted. A general discussion with all participants was followed to achieve a synthesis of different clusters of perspective on CBTE collaborative marketing.

Content analysis
The collected data were transcribed verbatim and were analysed manually using the techniques of content analysis (Berg, 1995). Specifically, content analysis was employed to narrate two categories adhered with the data: (1) reasons for the divergent perspectives and (2) a proposed collaborative

| Table 3. The workshop participants as per categories and discussion clusters. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Categories                      | Participants                    | Concurrent discussion groups    |
| Tourism corporations            | T01; T08; T09; T010             | Tourism business-related        |
| CBTE co-operative               | Co-op3                          | Government-related              |
| Government-based associations    | GA1; GA2                        |                                 |
| Local authorities               | LA3                             |                                 |
| Tourism government              | TG1                             | Community-related               |
| Tourism suppliers at destination | TS1                             |                                 |
| NGO                             | NGO8                            |                                 |
| Local entrepreneurs             | LE1; LE5                        |                                 |
| Other stakeholders (CBT promoters) | OS3; OS4                     |                                 |
| Total participants              | 15                              |                                 |
marketing framework for CBTE sustainability based on the reconciliation of perspectives; as well as identify components in each categories. The outcomes of this analysis are presented below.

**CBTE collaborative marketing in Vietnam: the synthesis of perspectives**

This section provides the outcomes from the process of reconciling conflicting perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing. Based on interviews in Stage 1, there appeared to be a gap between perspectives on desirable collaborative marketing approaches to CBTE sustainability and an achievable collaborative marketing approach tailor-made for a particular CBTE. Thus, the reconciliation of divergent perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing appeared to be a trade-off process between desirable and achievable CBTE collaborative marketing approaches. During the interactions and negotiations in the workshop, participants attempted to achieve a synthesis of perspectives on a collaborative marketing approach for CBTE sustainability in Vietnam, which are outlined below.

**Reasons for the divergence of perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and business sustainability**

**The limited understanding of involved stakeholders**

Limitations in the perception of CBTE stakeholders explain the difference in perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and business sustainability. Indeed, poor knowledge of the domain, i.e. CBTE, marketing and sustainability, was regarded as the root of all incongruent issues and unsuccessful CBT development. Limited understanding caused poor-conscience behaviours from local stakeholders in CBTE collaborative marketing, which consequently broke up partnerships and threatened CBT development models. The story of a tour operator (TO10) highlighted this issue and its effects.

Recently, my guests visited the village [Boohong] and stayed overnight. When the guests just left their room, their belongings were stolen. We reported this theft to the local government and received a reply that they would not solve the problem although we had made an agreement in advance that the government would be responsible for the visiting guests’ safety and security [...]. The local government said this was because we did not register temporary residence for the guests [which is another story of inappropriate behaviours from local stakeholders]. In response to my requests for help in welcoming guests to the village, the local government always asks me that how much [commission rate] they will receive in return for their coordination […]. Another example [about limited understanding of local stakeholders] is Triem Tay. Triem Tay used to be a very peaceful village. Since tourism activities have been popularised here, the locals have started fighting over economic benefits. Additionally, CBTE stakeholders’ poor perception of CBT inhibited the proposal of social entrepreneurship for a more sustainable marketing approach for CBTEs. One participant (TO1) explained, “With the current understanding of CBTE stakeholders in Vietnam, the proposal of social entrepreneurship is challenging, given that it needs cognitive changes from all involved stakeholders”. Thus, in pursuing a better marketing approach for CBTE sustainability, participants reiterated the essence of the changed perception of all stakeholders (TG1, TO9).

Accordingly, the knowledge the CBTE stakeholders lack was know-how. A statement from a local entrepreneur exemplified the lack of know-how among stakeholders. She stated, “We [the locals] would like to develop tourism, but we lack direction and guidelines” (LE5). Know-how equips stakeholders with general instructions that are consequently adopted in situ. Due to the lack of know-how, stakeholder interventions are mainly based on intuitive knowledge, which is highly situated, and thereby diverse.

**Individuality in collective efforts**

Leading individuals (e.g. managers of tour operators, founders of social enterprises, members of a community representative board, and owners of CBTEs) play a crucial role in CBTE collaborative marketing. However, the dilemma of individualism versus collectivism in the leaders’ engagement aroused scepticism about leaders’ legitimacy. In particular, CBTE stakeholders concerned about the
social entrepreneurs’ ability to balance personal greed and collective benefits in CBTE collaborative marketing. For instance, as per the workshop participants, regardless of the potential of social enterprises in leveraging successful CBTE collaborative marketing, the concept of social entrepreneurship was limited by the scarcity of committed key individuals. Participant TO1 commented,

With the current conditions in Vietnam, it is rare and time consuming to find an individual who would be capable of successfully establishing a social enterprise. He or she might flinch from financial pressures [confronted during the process].

There was also a risk associated with clarifying individual benefits and community benefits through the commitment of key individuals. Participant OS3, a CBTE promoter, explained,

It will be very risky to have CBTEs working with a community leader whose motivation for engagement is not community-oriented […] Conflicts between community benefits and individual benefits will occur […] which lead to a CBTE collaborative marketing approach with less effective outcomes than expected.

Thus, the issue of individuality in collective efforts caused the concept of social enterprises in CBTE collaborative marketing to be an easy-to-talk-about but hard-to-practice proposal, thereby regulating diverse perspectives on the proposal.

The recognition of the “self” and “others” among CBTE stakeholders

The workshop participants discussed the impact of stakeholder self-righteousness in CBTE marketing relationships. Specifically, the egocentrism of CBTE stakeholders resulted in divergent perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development. In its place, the behaviour of appreciating other voices was advocated.

The government typically experiences advantages and disadvantages while being involved in CBTE development, and so do other stakeholders. Thus, their roles need to be balanced, and their benefits need to be reconciled [among each other]. (OS3)

Contextual factors

Cultural contextualisation could exacerbate divergent objectives of CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development. Specifically, achieving CBTE sustainability related to long-term assessments, whereas local entrepreneurs in CBTEs in less-developed countries were more motivated by short-term incentives. A representative of a tourism organisation (TO1) stated, “As most local entrepreneurs [of CBTEs in Vietnam] are from an agriculture-driven livelihood system, they do care for immediate benefits. […] That is the issue of culture. The stories of other countries may be different […]”. The cultural characteristics of local entrepreneurs from a less-developed country were incongruent with CBTE marketing proposals aimed at long-term benefits. Because of this dilemma, the collaborative marketing objectives of CBTEs are arguably developed dichotomously. CBTE marketing strategies aiming at commercial viability objectives are advocated by stakeholders who believe in the power of economic incentives to force local entrepreneurs to preserve indigenous culture and natural environments. Likewise, CBTE marketing strategies focusing on community development objectives are developed by stakeholders who seek to protect local entrepreneurs from being seduced by the economic inveiglements of tourism.

Additionally, the imperative but ineffective performance of the Vietnamese political economy contributed to the divergence of perspectives regarding government intervention levels in CBTE collaborative marketing. Specifically, in this study, Vietnam’s cumbersome and inefficient administrative system discouraged stakeholders from advocating for managerial interventions by the government in CBTE collaborative marketing. According to the participants, governmental tourism organisations adhered to a vertically administrative tourism system in Vietnam and could not continuously support every CBTE. Likewise, at the local level, local authorities took charge of multiple economic-socio-cultural dimensions of the destination, of which tourism was just one part. The inaccessibility of governmental tourism organisations, accelerated by the incompetence of local authorities in CBT
development, is a hurdle to CBTE collaborative marketing. A participant (TO9) explained: “It is a mechanism stemming from the centrally planned economy [that impedes stakeholders from collaborating with the government effectively and successfully].” Nevertheless, the government, because of its indispensable entanglement in economic activities, could significantly propel CBTE collaborative marketing approaches towards long-term success. The government, empowered by the political regime of Vietnam, a one-party communist country, could drive CBT development at the macro level. Participant TO1 stated, “As our economy is market-driven but socialist-oriented, the government has advantages for controlling the CBTE development, [and therefore, it can drive CBTE development in a sustainable way].” Additionally, it could also monitor CBTEs at the local level. A local entrepreneur (LE1) complained:

The river in our village [Triem Tay] [which is a primary tourist attraction of the village] has been recently exploited by some external investors. However, we do not have a voice […]. It is the government [who is responsible for this issue]. We just follow the law.

The gap between the actual performance of the government and its potential power explained the controversy surrounding the government’s intervention in CBTE collaborative marketing.

Insufficient policy support also explained the difference in perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and business sustainability. In Vietnam, the policy framework has not kept up with the proliferation of innovative economic initiatives (Vuong, 2014), as was also apparent in the findings of this study. The lack of a policy framework hindered the practicability of social enterprises in CBTE collaborative marketing. The lack of a concrete and supportive policy framework deterred the evolution of social entrepreneurship underlying CBT development and bred scepticism from both CBTE stakeholders and the wider community. Participant TO1 commented, “The proposal of a social enterprise [to facilitate CBTE collaborative marketing] is awesome. But what we need [at this stage] is a legal framework with clear criteria to categorise a social enterprise”. Thus, without a clear and supportive authority, the proposal of social entrepreneurship could not transform into practice.

Reconciling incongruent perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and business sustainability: a proposed framework

Perspectives need to be improved and right directed

Improvement in stakeholders’ perspectives was needed in two directions. First, stakeholders’ perspectives should be improved in regards to the current wealth of knowledge on CBTE development and tourism sustainability. The workshop participants stated the need for a balance between commercial viability and community wellbeing in entrepreneurship for CBTE sustainability.

The perspectives of both internal and external stakeholders of CBTEs need to be changed in terms of balancing economic and non-economic objectives in CBTE development. (GA2)

Specifically, the required form of knowledge was know-how, which is adopted from academic knowledge and is contextualised to appeal to stakeholders. For instance, a tourist supplier at a CBT destination commented, “The insights in your presentation [the first author’s presentation sharing the interview findings] are great, but that is academic knowledge. What we need is practical knowledge that we can apply straight away” (TS). Another participant questioned,

Good Travel [a social enterprise based in New Zealand and working in CBT development] mentioned in the workshop presentation is an ideal example of social enterprises. But, how to apply that exemplar to the context of Vietnam is still needed. (TO1)

Second, stakeholders’ perspectives should appreciate and be open to other viewpoints, understand the existing differences, and accept harmonisation. One tour operator (TO9) stated:
None of the crucial stakeholders [tour operators, NGOs, the community, the government] should perceive the self as the best and underappreciate the others. [...]. Tour operators should not perceive [they are the most important], such as, without them, there would be no customers, and neither do other stakeholders.

The improved and properly directed perspectives of CBTEs were proposed to reconcile incongruent perspectives and foster CBTE collaborative marketing towards businesses’ long-term success. They would dissolve the hesitation of local authorities in engaging in CBT development, as contested by participant TO10.

The improved perspectives of all involved stakeholders will fundamentally solve all issues [...]. With appropriate perspectives, they [CBTE local stakeholders] will devote sufficient commitments to CBT development, [...] which will consequently result in greater benefits for all.

**A set of rules governing stakeholder interventions**

A set of rules governing stakeholder interventions was needed in a CBTE collaborative marketing approach to ensure business sustainability. Tour operator TO9 contested,

There needs to be a set of rules regulating relationships among four crucial stakeholders [i.e. the government, the community, tour operators, and tourism associations].

This set of rules was built upon the premise of appreciating different knowledge sources and empowering multiple viewpoints in knowledge generation. Specifically, the workshop participants argued for the development of a set of rules in conjunction with current knowledge on CBTE sustainability through expert consultations. Concomitantly, the rules should recognise the voices of crucial stakeholders (local entrepreneurs, community alliances, tour operators and the government). One participant stated,

A set of rules needs to be created prior to beginning [any project] [...]. If we facilitate CBTE initiatives without careful considerations [harnessed in a set of rules], conflicts will occur. Thus, we need consultant experts in collaboration with stakeholders to co-create the set, which should be legitimated by legal authorities. Once the set is established and the conceptual framework is created, we can start interventions. (TO1)

The rules will provide CBTE collaborations with a baseline regulating stakeholder behaviours, improving stakeholder understanding, and managing the potential negative impacts of individuality in collective efforts.

**The government’s involvement in CBTE collaborative marketing in terms of inspiration, control, and arbitration**

Despite the dilemma between the powerful potential of the government in CBTE collaborative marketing and its ineffective and inconsistent interventions, the involvement of the local government in CBTE collaborative marketing was still necessary. The government’s engagement was essential from the perspectives of both community and private partners. Specifically, government involvement was specified in terms of inspiration, control, and arbitration but not management. A representative of a CBTE co-operative said,

We [the community] do not ask for their [the local government] financial support. We only need their acknowledgement and encouragement to empower us. (Co-op3)

Likewise, a tour operator added, “As the tourism model we are developing is community-based tourism, interventions from the local government are always necessary and indispensable”.

Indeed, the government’s involvement in CBTE collaborative marketing helped tackle the dilemma in several ways. First, by supporting CBTEs in developing collaborative marketing networks at a destination, the local government could improve their perspective, thus, helping leverage CBTE collaborative marketing sustainably.

Through their involvement, they [the local government] will acknowledge the current status of tourism development of which they are in charge [...] [and consequently] they will raise voices for improvements. [Otherwise],
they are ignorant of what the community has done, [thus] they have no benefits [and] no voices [to support the CBT implementation]. (NGO8)

Concomitantly, the local government also benefited from involvement, which in turn helped maintain their commitment to CBT development.

The local government needs to […] work with the community, [and consequently], [economic and political] benefits for them will come. (TO10)

The transformation from successful tour operators to social entrepreneurship in CBTE collaborative marketing

Social entrepreneurship is preferable in a CBTE collaborative marketing approach oriented towards business sustainability. Specifically, there was an achieved agreement on the proposal to transform successful tour operators from for-profit businesses to social entrepreneurship to facilitate CBTE collaborative marketing.

A social enterprise [in CBTE collaboration marketing] should be a profit-making company with advanced perspectives on economic development […] and corporate social responsibility. (TO1)

Successful tour operators are high-performing and sustainably profitable companies. They are experienced in product marketing and tourism. Additionally, their business mission is oriented towards community contributions rather than exclusively economic profits. Because of these characteristics, successful tour operators satisfy the roles and visions of a social enterprise.

The key criterion for a successful relationship between a social enterprise and its partners engaged in CBTE collaborative marketing was to clarify benefits for involved partners. Doing so helps minimise potential benefit-related disputes among involved stakeholders. For the participants, an agreement to clarify the benefits between a social enterprise, CBTEs and the community was needed. This agreement should be recognised by local authorities and governmental tourism organisations.

The first thing to clarify in the establishment of social enterprises is the accredited rate of benefit sharing among the partners […]. [And] there needs to be an authorised, government-based stakeholder who monitors the benefits from social enterprises delivered to the community following specific objectives and criteria. (TO9)

Discussion

This study contributes to discussions of stakeholder collaboration in marketing CBTEs for sustainable development in two aspects. First, through a suggested transformation from successful tour operators to social entrepreneurship to facilitate CBTE marketing collaborations, this study elucidates the central linkage of a CBTE and a social enterprise in a CBTE marketing network to better promote the business sustainability, which is originally indicated in the study of Ngo et al. (in press). Governed by social entrepreneurship, a tour operator can subsidise the marketing drawbacks of CBTE by their business expertise of a tourism corporation while still maintaining community development at priority owing to their social mission. Second, this study argues for the significance of cognitive consensus in CBT collaborative efforts. Decision-making processes in collaborative terrains, to a certain degree, require achieving cognitive consensus among involved stakeholders. Kilduff, Angelmar, and Mehra (2000) state that collaborative efforts with relatively high cognitive consensus likely produce better performance, given that the cognitive consensus helps regulate a stakeholder’s behaviour and actions to be consistent with others and with the decision’s principles (Amason, 1996). To this end, a cognitive consensus is an integrated part and a fundamental step of a broader consensus-building process for tourism collaboration (Holland, 2000; Jamal & Getz, 1999). However, a cognitive consensus is challenging due to the differences in stakeholders’ understanding and diverging perspectives (Whitford & Ruhanen, 2016). Through this study, we suggest a decolonisation of the power of knowledge in cognitive consensus building process. In particular,
acknowledging different viewpoints and offering platforms for knowledge dialogue to reconciling different viewpoints can facilitate the achievement of cognitive consensus in CBTE collaborative marketing.

The significance of a knowledge co-production approach in bridging the research-practice gap is discussed in this study. The research-practice gap has been extensively identified in the tourism literature (see Mair, Merton, & Smith, 2014; Whitford & Ruhanen, 2010). As a result of this gap, the research outcomes of an academic study remain in academia’s “ivory” tower without connections to reality (Dredge & Jamal, 2015). Consequently, practitioners’ activities are planned and implemented without a long-term plan (Ruhanen, 2008). To this end, a knowledge co-production approach is capable to bridge the gap (Dredge et al., 2013). In this study, we discuss the factors of concern to facilitate such the potential of the knowledge co-production approach in the realm of CBT development. Indeed, we indicate the need for know-how among CBTE stakeholders, thereby suggesting the involvement of knowledge-brokering institutions in closing the gap. Know-how, according to Guzman (2009), is a dimension of practical knowledge that explains how to engage in a practical action. Know-how, as illustrated in this study, is relatively explainable compared to intuitive experience and is purposely practical compared to academic tourism research. As practitioners’ knowledge needs are different from knowledge generated by academic scholars from tourism research, knowledge-brokering institutions are necessary in CBT development. Knowledge-brokering institutions are the organisations that help adapt knowledge for end-users (Ruhanen, 2008), such as the Sustainable Tourism Corporate Research Centre in Australia (Cooper, Jago, Carlsen, & Ruhanen, 2006; Ruhanen, 2008). Specifically, from the findings of this study, we argue that cross-cultural capability is a prerequisite for knowledge-brokering institutions so that they can facilitate knowledge co-generation from knowledge-holders of different cosmologies and standpoints. This cross-cultural capability allows institutions to deliver the power of knowledge adequately among the insiders in a tourism knowledge co-generation process (Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Platenkamp, 2007).

We also investigate the potential of a knowledge co-production approach, which has recently been promoted in collaborative tourism research (Carr et al., 2016; Dredge & Jamal, 2015), in reconciling divergent perspectives. Specifically, in this study, a synthesis of perspectives was achieved over incongruent perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing and business sustainability. The synthesis of perspectives is achieved through the knowledge interactions, which are part of a knowledge co-production study. The process reflects a negotiation between a desirable approach and an achievable approach in the domain of CBTE collaborative marketing. Thus, the outcome of the process, which was a CBTE collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs, includes in its nature an effort to harmonise the gaps among different perspectives and different kinds of knowledge. Owing to this potential of a knowledge co-production approach, we argue for the plausibility of this approach in tourism collaborative research with people.

Practical contributions to CBT development in Vietnam are argued in this study. First, a collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs, as proposed in this study, is expected to minimise the knowledge gap hindering stakeholders’ interventions, decrease benefit conflicts among involved stakeholders, and promote long-term stakeholder partnerships, all of which consequently foster CBTE sustainability. Within the CBT and sustainable tourism literature, the proposed framework in this study is an initial effort aimed at driving stakeholder collaborations in CBTE marketing partnerships oriented towards business sustainability. This framework is, therefore, regarded as a response to the call for a medium for poverty alleviation in tourism based on lessons from academic studies and applicable by practitioners in less-developed countries (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012). Indeed, the framework, while providing implications for CBTE development in Vietnam, is valuable for similar contexts of CBTEs in less-developed countries. Second, this paper confirms the essence of government interventions in CBTE collaborative marketing in Vietnam. This finding, consistent with other studies stressing the roles of government and their governance in tourism collaborative activities (Keyim, 2017), highlights the overwhelming power of government stakeholders within the political economy in a one-party communist country (Michaud & Turner, 2017;
Truong et al., 2014). Indeed, this study illustrates the regulations of the politics of Vietnam on tourism activities in the context of CBTE development.

Conclusion

This paper examined the significance of a knowledge co-production approach in reconciling diverse perspectives on CBTE collaborative marketing for sustainable development, and as outcomes of the reconciliation process, identified attributes of a proposed collaborative marketing framework for the sustainable development of CBTEs. The findings from the research revealed that a synthesis of perspectives was achieved and a framework directing CBTE collaborative marketing towards business sustainability was identified, consisting of four attributes. First, stakeholders’ perspectives must be improved and directed towards understanding the current wealth of knowledge and appreciating the viewpoints of others. Second, a set of rules governing stakeholder collaborations is co-created by involved stakeholders. Third, the involvement of the government in the role of controller and arbitrator in CBTE collaborative marketing is encouraged for long-term business success. Fourth, successful tour operators transforming their businesses into social entrepreneurship can facilitate the CBTE collaborative marketing network upon clarifying the structure of benefits. The framework aims to provide a baseline for the initiation and implementation of collaborative marketing activities for the sustainable development of CBTEs.

This paper indicates the significance of knowledge dialogue within a knowledge co-production study to provide a platform for negotiations to synthesise diverse perspectives. It also argues for the role of knowledge-brokering organisations with cross-cultural capabilities to reduce the research-practice gap. Additionally, the study advocates for a decolonisation of the power of knowledge in CBT collaborations reflected in cognitive consensus achievement among stakeholders of different perspectives. Furthermore, the findings include an assessment of the government’s intervention in CBTE collaborative marketing regulated under the political economy of a communist country.

Limitations are acknowledged in this study, and thereby implications for future research are presented. Evaluating the significance of the proposed framework of collaborative marketing in CBTE development in less-developed countries was outside the scope of this study. Thus, endeavours to assess the framework in different contexts would be useful to develop a collaborative marketing model for CBTE sustainability. Also, as knowledge dialogues between different perspectives trigger social learning (Berkes, 2009), an evaluation on learning outcomes reflected in knowledge holders would help to elucidate the potential of a knowledge co-production approach in tourism studies.

Note

1. Apart from the stakeholders of the three case studies, nine additional stakeholders were included in interviews. They included stakeholders who significantly influenced the development of CBT in Vietnam. The overlapping numbers of stakeholders were because some stakeholders were involved in more than one case study.
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Chapter 6: Collaborative marketing strategy for the business sustainability of CBTEs

6.1. Introduction

The literature review in Chapter 2 indicated that linkages between CBTE marketing and business sustainability are under-studied. In addition, there is a lack of efforts addressing the paradoxes linked with CBTE collaborative marketing. It was also reported in Chapter 2 the potential of the *third way* and *third space* approaches to regulating CBTE collaborative marketing towards business sustainability. Accordingly, among the findings obtained in Chapter 4, a balanced marketing approach was perceived as better promoting the long-term success of CBTEs. However, it was not addressed in these findings that how such the balanced marketing approach can be particularised into CBTE marketing strategies. It also remained undiscovered in the preceding chapters that how the paradoxes linked with CBTE collaborative marketing are addressed in the proposed marketing strategies by integrating the *third way* and *third space* approaches.

The above indications inform the direction of this chapter. Accordingly, this chapter aims to configure a marketing strategy tailor-made for the business sustainability of CBTEs (RO4). The research methodology presented in Chapter 3 frames the investigation. Through the marketing strategies proposed in this chapter, two arguments are claimed: (1) the *third way* approach together with the *third space* approach can address the paradoxical nature of the domain of CBTE collaborative marketing; and (2) the principles of sustainable tourism marketing can tackle the marketing issues of CBTEs in less-developed countries through evidence-based, practice-driven guidance.
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6.2. (The paper - Under review) Integrating the *third way* and *third space* approaches in a post-colonial world: marketing strategies for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises in Vietnam.
Integrating the *third way* and *third space* approaches in a post-colonial world: marketing strategies for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises in Vietnam

Abstract

This study investigates the potential to integrate *third way* and *third space* approaches in marketing community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) in less-developed countries. The outcome of this integration is reflected in marketing strategies oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam. In particular, proposals on three aspects of CBTE marketing, including market segmentation, product design and development, and product communication and promotion, are illustrated. Through the proposed marketing strategies, the research makes its theoretical contribution to the CBT literature by showing that wicked-natured, multi-paradoxical CBT problem domains can be better addressed by integrating different ideological approaches. Additionally, the strategies provide evidence-based, practice-driven guidance for the extensively evaluated but insufficiently tackled marketing issues for CBTEs in Vietnam.

**Keywords:** CBTEs, collaborative marketing, third way, third space, Vietnam

Introduction

Community-based tourism enterprises (CBTEs) have been widely recognised as an enterprise-based development model capable of maximising the benefits and minimising the negative impacts of tourism on a community. A CBTE is defined as a micro-scaled business located in a rural or remote area of a less-developed country and is characterised by the following fundamental attributes: it is owned, managed and operated by a local community, and it benefits that community (Lapeyre, 2010; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Spenceley, 2008). A CBTE can be in the form of a community-run business or a venture of a community household with contributions to the community. CBTEs have proliferated in less-developed countries as a mechanism for community transformation (i.e., empowerment, poverty alleviation, increased income, livelihood diversification, cultural conservation and environmental protection), which in turn contributes to
sustainable tourism at a destination (Tasci, Croes, & Bartels Villanueva, 2014; Zapata, Hall, Lindo, & Vanderschaeghe, 2011). However, these potential benefits of CBTEs can be activated only if a CBTE is commercially viable.

Among other management dimensions, marketing plays a crucial role in the business sustainability of CBTEs (Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Okazaki, 2008). A recurrent reason for the failure of CBTEs in less-developed countries is poor market access (Dixey, 2008; Häusler, 2008; Mielke, 2012). This operational challenge mainly occurs due to the physical remoteness of CBTEs as well as a lack of tourism know-how and marketing incompetence among local entrepreneurs (Espeso-Molinero, Carlisle, & Pastor-Alfonso, 2016; Notzke, 2004).

Through discussions of marketing and CBTE sustainability, it is clear that CBTE marketing endeavours should consider the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability to be successful. Within the scope of this research, CBTE business sustainability and CBTE long-term success are used interchangeably. At the core of these two concepts is a balancing of the dual objectives of commercial viability and community development. The dual objectives of CBTE sustainability have been widely identified as creating a self-sustaining business, juxtaposed with preserving indigenous values and enhancing community well-being (Carr, Ruhanen, & Whitford, 2016; Manyara & Jones, 2005). Indeed, Ngo, Lohmann, and Hales (2018) argue that to achieve long-term success, CBTEs should pursue the attainment of the dual objectives in their marketing strategies through balancing contradictory tourism development approaches included in CBTE marketing. However, there is still a lack of research examining efforts to balance the tourism paradoxes in the context of CBTE marketing, thereby promoting the fulfillment of the dual objectives for business sustainability in CBTE marketing strategies.

In the efforts to delineate marketing initiatives oriented towards CBTE sustainability, the idea of collaborative marketing is involved. Regardless of their approaches, CBTEs always require marketing assistance from external stakeholders, such as tour operators or philanthropists (Reggers Grabowski, Wearing, Chatterton, & Schweinsberg, 2016; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Zapata et al., 2011). However, post-colonialisation is also associated with the involvement of external stakeholders in CBTE marketing strategies. Thus, optimising the potential
benefits of stakeholder collaborations in CBTE marketing while simultaneously minimising the hazards of post-colonialisation embedded in marketing partnerships is crucial to developing CBTE marketing strategies. However, this gap has not been addressed in the CBT literature.

The present study aims to address the abovementioned gap by integrating the *third way* approach in CBT development and the *third space* approach in CBT marketing to propose a marketing strategy that prioritises the long-term success of CBTEs. Based on a case study of Vietnam, this paper's objectives are twofold: (1) to investigate the significance of integrating ideological approaches to better orient marketing endeavours towards the business sustainability of CBTEs and; (2) to configure the components of a marketing strategy for CBTE long-term success in Vietnam.

Accordingly, the paper is structured in six sections. After the Introduction, the Literature review section presents the justification for integrating the *third way* approach in CBT development and the *third space* approach in CBT marketing to theoretically frame a CBTE marketing strategy for business sustainability. Then, in the Methodology section, the constructivist paradigm and the knowledge co-production approach are employed to guide the research design. Next, the Findings section illustrates marketing strategies in market segmentation, product design and development, and product communication and promotion for CBTEs in Vietnam. The Discussion section follows, in which the contributions of the study are described. Finally, the Conclusion section summarises the research findings, research limitations and indicates potential avenues for future research based on the contributions of the present study.

**Literature review**

*Polarised CBTE marketing strategies and their responsiveness to the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries*

The literature on CBTEs in less-developed countries highlights a range of dichotomies with regard to CBTE marketing strategies. The scope of less-developed countries set in this study is aligned with the category of emerging and
developing economies used by the International Monetary Fund (IMF, 2015, April). Based on this category, and with reference to the development of CBT in different parts of the world, the marketing activities of CBTEs in African, Latin American, and Asian countries are examined. Likewise, under a post-colonial era, polarities in targeted markets and market segmentation of CBTEs, dilemmas in the marketisation of CBT products, and the paradoxical linkages between local entrepreneurs and travel intermediaries are interrogated.

International travellers have shown substantial interest in the offerings of CBTEs in less-developed countries. In addition to the mainstream flows of international tourists crossing national borders for leisure, exoticism and novelty seeking (Kontogeorgopoulos, Churyen, & Duangsaeng, 2013; Phommavong & Sörensson, 2012), the international market of CBTEs in less-developed countries is also configured by niche segments. CBTEs can stimulate tourist flows from developed regions to less-developed countries for goodwill and fair-trading tourism purposes (Evan & Cleverdon, 2000; Schéou & Southon, 2013). The networks of donors, NGOs, and international development agencies in the developed world also represent a source of international visitors to donors-funded, NGOs-aided CBTEs in the developing world, as indicated in the study of Zapata et al. (2011). However, the insufficient knowledge and skills of local entrepreneurs juxtaposed with the unfamiliarity of local communities with the alien culture represented by foreign travellers cause marketing efforts connecting CBTEs to these market segments to confront paradoxical challenges. For instance, CBTEs are passively dependent on international tour operators, external sponsors, and other intermediaries to access the market (Schéou & Southon, 2013; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008). This passive dependence results in benefit leakages, foreign resource control, changed positions of local entrepreneurs in value chains, and even business collapse after a funded period (Dixey, 2008; Manyara & Jones, 2007; Zapata et al., 2011).

Polarised market segmentation approaches, i.e., niche market versus mainstream market, differentiate CBTE marketing strategies. Some CBTEs are marketed to a niche market, the travellers to which are most likely wealthy, highly educated, and intrinsically interested in indigenous values and community benefits (Notzke, 2004). However, the limited size of niche markets challenges the practicality of this
approach (Notzke, 2004). In contrast, there are efforts to integrate CBTEs’ products into mainstream tourism through linkages between CBTEs and tour operators. However, these efforts confront the issue of product quality. Van Der Duim and Caalders (2008) illustrate a service quality gap, in which local partners fail to meet the requirements of industry partners. Additionally, issues involving commoditised authenticity, dissension within the community and between community members and private partners are associated with this approach (Häusler, 2008; Koot, 2016).

The marketisation of CBT products offered by CBTEs in less-developed countries is confronted with the antitheses of authenticity versus inauthenticity, and modern versus primitive. In his ethnographic study of the !Xaus Lodge (South Africa), Koot (2016) depicted this contradiction. The !Xaus Lodge is promoted as a CBTE owned by the ‡Khomani San (Bushmen) and Mier communities in South Africa (https://www.xauslodge.co.za/about-us). According to Koot (2016), the Bushmen are conventionally encouraged to museumise themselves to represent the ‡Khomani, who have been hunter-gather groups in the region at the beginning of the twentieth century. Through role performances and traditional dress, the Bushmen stay authentic to attract tourists, who in turn impose modernity as consumers. To this end, the Bushmen (and their authenticity) are regarded as a tourism product. This commodification and brand-building of indigenous people are inherently incompatible with the inevitable inauthenticity associated with capitalism, economic development, and modernity brought about through tourism. Concomitantly, this CBT commodification also clashes with the objective of “community empowerment” that external stakeholders, including tourism operators, propagandise in their interventions with this CBTE. Indeed, the common knowledge that “tourists do not come all the way to this small village only to be shown blenders, t-shirts emblazoned with sports team logos and other signposts of all things modern” reflects the contradiction between modern and primitive in “selling” CBT products (Taylor, 2014, p. 219).

Related to the contradiction in the commercialisation of CBT products and the polarisation between niche market versus mainstream market segmentation strategies is the paradoxical linkage between local entrepreneurs and travel
intermediaries. The selection of market segments and the positioning of CBT products as a tourism commodity affect the extent to which the power relationships between local entrepreneurs and tourism operators are balanced. Tolkach and King (2015) argued that, by targeting visitors who accept limited services from local hosts, prioritising learning from hosts and appreciating solidarity in interactions with local entrepreneurs, CBTEs can leverage their bargaining power with tourism operators. Koot (2016) implied that by portraying local communities as representing authenticity to appeal tourists, imperialism is further reinforced in the relations of visitors and tourism intermediaries with local communities.

**Ideological challenges underlying CBTE marketing strategies**

CBT ideological debates emerge from the abovementioned CBTE marketing strategies. Paradoxes in potential target markets, market segmentation strategies, CBT marketisation, and in the linkages between local entrepreneurs and tourism intermediaries exemplify the antithesis between neoliberalism and protectionism. A neoliberal approach emphasises the significance of individualised economies, market liberalisation, and laissez-faire economic strategies characterised by minimal interventions of the government in trading processes (Öniş & Şenses, 2005; Scheyvens, 2007). In contrast, protectionism focuses on tourism as a social force (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006). Under the neoliberal approach, marketing is argued to be an economic tool that is crucial to leverage the market appeal of CBTEs. An outstanding example of this viewpoint is reflected in the attempts to outsource CBTE marketing to private partners under joint venture partnerships and in the mainstream segmentation approaches of CBTEs (Torres, Skillicorn, & Nelson, 2011; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Contrastingly, supporters of protectionism argue that a commercialisation-driven direction associated with marketing tools can confront the achievement of a CBTE’s development objectives. Thus, flows of philanthropic travellers and niche marketing segmentations are encouraged. Likewise, under the neoliberal ideology, CBTE marketing strategies are characterised by market-driven approaches, private corporations’ hegemony and commercial viability goals. Meanwhile, within the protectionist approach,
CBTE marketing strategies focus on community well-being and social goals (Ngo et al., 2018).

Neither neo-liberalism nor protectionism in CBTE marketing can lead to CBTE business sustainability. It is argued that the interference-free neoliberal approach is ineffective in framing CBTEs over the long-term (Koot, 2016; Schilcher, 2007; Snyman, 2014). For instance, the remedy of outsourcing CBTE marketing to tour operators, as often occurred in joint venture partnerships between a CBTE and a private partner, may leverage the commercial viability of a venture without proper consideration of the conservation and well-being objective (Manyara & Jones, 2005). Meanwhile, the solely protection-driven approach is inappropriate for CBTEs, which embraces economic activities. The practices of CBTEs in less-developed countries indicate that CBTE projects prioritise the attainment of development objectives without proper consideration of the business’ commercial viability would often result in the collapse of the business (Dodds, Ali, & Galaski, 2016; Häusler, 2008; Mielke, 2012). Thus, under neo-liberalism, CBTEs should be aware of both the market-driven nature of marketing practices and the transformative capacity of marketing tools for the community. However, it is still unknown where on the spectrum between neo-liberalism and protectionism that CBTE marketing strategies for business sustainability should be framed. The third way approach is therefore employed in the present study to address this question.

The paradoxical marketing strategies of CBTEs in less-developed countries are also related to the opposition between post-colonialism and de-colonialism. Post-colonialism and de-colonialism are alternative approaches to addressing the power relations in multi-actor relationships. Post-colonialism refers to relations between the colonised and coloniser, which re-emerge in situations in which independent countries suffer from the intervention and control of external states (Hall & Tucker, 2004). CBTE marketing is regarded as an easily colonised domain of CBT development for two reasons: the inherent business incapability of local entrepreneurs juxtaposed with the expertise and business skills required for this task (Malatji & Mtapuri, 2012; Mitchell & Muckosy, 2008; Okazaki, 2008). Additionally, the product offerings of CBTEs cannot be isolated from the influence of tourists, supply chains, foreign tour operators and other travel intermediaries
(Manyara & Jones, 2007; Tolkach & King, 2015; Van Der Duim & Caalders, 2008). Indeed, numerous studies have attempted to balance the power relationships between local communities and external stakeholders in CBT development through a decolonialism-oriented approach. Among these efforts are the bottom-up, locally initiated, non-monetised CBT model proposed by Sakata and Prideaux (2013), the bottom-up, locally initiated, domestic market-targeted CBT model of Zapata et al. (2011), and the bottom-up CBT model of Reggers et al. (2016). Nevertheless, regardless of the priority given to community empowerment and non-economic objectives, these bottom-up, de-colonial oriented models accept the necessity of (marketing) assistance from external stakeholders. For instance, Reggers et al. (2016) suggest a model driven by the community, but working in partnership with tour operators and philanthropists. Similarly, Sakata and Prideaux (2013) recognise the necessity of tourism marketing assistance from external organisations for sustainable practices in their proposed CBT model. Thus, post-colonialism cannot be completely demolished in the realm of CBTE marketing. The entanglement between CBTE marketing and post-colonialism is relevant as long as CBTEs are still a tourism business in the tourism system (Tolkach & King, 2015). However, in the post-colonial sphere, there is a lack of mechanisms to regulate the marketing interactions between CBTEs and external stakeholders through which the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability can be balanced. The present study addresses this knowledge gap through the principles of the third space approach.

The third way and third space approaches in CBT and their incorporation to drive marketing practices towards CBTE business sustainability

The potential of the third way approach is increasingly advocated in tourism development studies. According to Giddens (1998, p.26), the third-way approach is “a framework of thinking and policymaking that seeks to adapt social democracy to a world which has changed fundamentally over the past two or three decades. It is a third way in the sense that it is an attempt to transcend both old-style social democracy and neoliberalism” (cited in Burns, 2004). In tourism, the third way approach is characterised by certain attributes. The approach proposes alternative sets of arguments about tourism planning and development through an
understanding of the contradictions and tensions between the Development First approach and the Tourism First approach to sustainable development (Burns, 2004). In addition, the third way approach acknowledges the need to balance idealism and pragmatism in tourism endeavours based on the nuanced linkages between tourism and sustainable development. Additionally, the approach argues for the inclusion of all voices, particularly marginalised voices, and having these voices agreed at the outset about tourism planning and development. The third way approach, therefore, moves away from the two ends of the spectrum of neoliberalism and protectionism by proposing an alternative approach or arguing for a balance on the spectrum (Higgins-Desbiolles, 2006; Schilcher, 2007). Concomitantly, the approach proposes an alternative perspective regarding the two extreme dogmas of tourism being either a panacea for less-developed countries or the root of all their problems (Spenceley & Meyer, 2012; Weaver, 2010). To this end, the third way approach is closely associated with a post-structural perspective (Scheyvens, 2007). Both these viewpoints seek an alternative approach to the other extreme, reductionist, conventional, polarised approaches. This alternative approach is developed based on the principles of participation, acknowledgement of multiple perspectives, and empowerment of marginalised voices.

The third space approach is widely employed in the realm of tourism interactions. According to Bhabha (1994, p.5), the third space is a space “between fixed identifications [that] opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy”. The approach allows tourism research to address the unbalanced power relations and different perspectives involved in tourism interactions (Leeming, 2016; Van der Duim, Peters, & Wearing, 2005). Within the third space framework, tourism social actors are encouraged to move away from their pre-assumed, institutionalised, archaeological perspectives to acknowledge and appreciate the perspective of the Others (Hollinshead, 1998). Concomitantly, they detach themselves from pre-identified, fixed categories of identity to fully engage in a different culture. Additionally, the third space approach can facilitate a hybrid agora for cultural differentiation, eliminate inequitable power relationships and allow for change and the reconstruction of identity (Hunter, 2001; Wearing & Wearing, 2006). Thus,
this approach is argued to frame research on cultural practices in tourism, the representation of ethnicity in tourism interactions and the marketing of cultural attractions (Hollinshead, 1998). Indeed, many studies have affirmed the significance of the third space approach in addressing the polarities of authenticity versus inauthenticity and modern versus primitive in the commodification of CBT experiences (see Dolezal, 2011; Van der Duim et al., 2005).

In this research, the third way approach and the third space approach are integrated to theoretically frame the proposal of a marketing strategy for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam. Based on the previously presented literature review, it is clear that within the domain of CBTE marketing, the aspects of stakeholder interventions, post-colonialism, marketisation of indigenous values, and the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability are interrelated. These interrelated aspects regulate the entanglement of the domain of CBTE marketing in both CBT development and CBT marketing debates. Accordingly, the third way approach and the third space approach are integrated to theoretically frame an investigation on CBTE marketing for business sustainability. Due to its potential to reconcile the neoliberalism-protectionism antithesis, the third way approach is arguably a plausible way to frame the development of a marketing strategy for CBTE long-term success. In particular, the third way approach enables the reconciliation of polarised CBTE marketing strategies through its capacity to balance the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability in the proposed marketing strategy. Simultaneously, the third space approach can re-distribute power in tourism interactions and therefore is employed to guide the marketing relationships between CBTEs’ local entrepreneurs and external intermediaries and reconcile the paradoxes in the marketisation of CBT products.

Setting the scene: marketing practices for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam

In Vietnam, the CBT concept was initiated in the early 2000s, in light of the political support of the central government and the financial assistance and advisory services of development agencies and NGOs. In their design, CBT initiatives in Vietnam have been oriented towards poverty alleviation purposes (Hummel, Gujadhur, & Ritsma, 2013; Truong, Hall, & Garry, 2014). The potential of
tourism for poverty alleviation was confirmed for the first time in the economic development strategy of 2001-2010 by the central authority, which consequently paved the way for the proliferation of CBT initiatives in the rural and mountainous regions of Vietnam (Truong, 2013). Under the political support of the government, numerous international development agencies and NGOs facilitated donor-funded CBTEs for the pro-poor objectives. In addition to donor-aided CBTE projects, self-funded CBTEs or joint ventures with tour operators have flourished for the objective of income increase for the community (Nguyen, 2016).

In contrast to the remarkable growth of CBTEs in Vietnam, there is a limited wealth of knowledge about CBTE planning and development in Vietnam in general and CBTE marketing in particular. The available literature about this topic is mainly sourced from the handbooks and manuals published by CBT donors. These include the Toolkit on Poverty Alleviation through Tourism by the International Labour Organisation (ILO, 2012), the Guidance Manual for Developing Community-Based Tourism by the Asia Foundation (TAF, 2012), the Community-Based Tourism Development in Sapa, Vietnam reported by the Netherland Development Agency (SNV, 2003), and the Manual for Developing Rural Tourism in Vietnam by the Japanese International Cooperation Agency (JICA, 2013). These documents share an emphasis on marketing as an essential part of CBTE planning. However, none of these documents indicates an effort to elaborate on the components of a marketing strategy to guide CBTEs to achieve their long-term success. This lack of evidence-based guidance causes chaos and unsustainability in the marketing practices of CBTEs (Khoi, 2017; Nguyen, 2016).

With very little academic literature relating to the topic of CBT and marketing in the context of Vietnam, CBTEs have faced critical issues associated with their marketing efforts to connect their businesses with potential travellers. Local CBT entrepreneurs have an extreme inferior relationship with non-local tourism intermediaries in sales and marketing, resulting in tourism revenue leakage (Chau, 2014). Additionally, a contractual partnership with a sole tourism operator prevents a CBTE from appealing to other tourism intermediaries and increases the threat of supplier-distributor role exchange, as seen in the case of the Droong CBT village (Vietnam) (Ngo & Doan, 2014). Through this case study, Ngo and Doan...
(2014) also found a failure in the communication tools of local entrepreneurs, a lack of quality in the CBTE’s service offerings that prevents integration with mainstream tourism, and a lack of marketing strategies to attract the niche market of transformative tourism. Furthermore, the conventional perspective of seeing the “Other” as exotic prevails among CBTEs and Western visitors in their encounters in Vietnam (Stevens, 2010).

Thus, a marketing strategy framed by the principles of the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability, and that is capable of addressing the paradoxes in CBTE marketing is needed to guide the marketing practices of CBTEs in Vietnam. Such a mechanism is important for the long-term success of CBTEs in Vietnam and can contribute to the sustainability of tourism destinations at the grassroots level.

**Methodology**

*Methodological approach*

This study fell within the constructivist paradigm of qualitative research (Guba, 1990; Hollinshead, 2006) and utilised the knowledge co-production approach (Armitage et al., 2011; Jasanoff, 2004), which is characterised by a participatory methodology (Kindon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007). This research paradigm has been widely advocated in tourism research involving multiple (and conflicting) perspectives. It helps to empower marginalised voices and practical wisdom in the research process, thereby enabling collaborative knowledge benefits, closing the research-practice gap and promoting the societal contributions of research (Carr et al., 2016; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Nielsen & Wilson, 2012).

The elaboration on marketing strategies for CBTE business sustainability in Vietnam is developed based on the principles of sustainable tourism marketing. Sustainable tourism marketing is "the application of marketing functions, processes and techniques to a destination, resource or offering, which serves the needs of the visitor and stakeholder community today and ensures the opportunities of future visitors and stakeholders to meet their needs in the future" (Font & McCage, 2017, p.871). It is argued that the principles of sustainable tourism marketing can reconcile dual objectives included in the paradoxical
tourism problems of sustainable development, such as in national parks (Mitchell, Wooliscroft & Higham, 2013; Wearing, Schweinsberg, & Tower, 2016), heritage sites (Chhabra, 2009; Donohoe, 2012) and CBTEs (Ngo et al., 2018). In particular, in this paper, the investigation is framed by the marketing mix for sustainable tourism marketing developed by Pomering, Noble, & Johnson (2011), which includes ten elements (i.e., product, price, place, promotion, participants, physical evidence, process, packaging, programming, and process) framed by a triple bottom line of sustainable tourism (i.e., sociocultural, environmental, and economic).

**Data collection**

This study consisted of two stages. The selection of research participants and the identification of research objectives in each stage are illustrated in the following subsections. Table 1 lists the research participants who participated in the interviews and workshop by stakeholder category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Group discussions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism corporations</td>
<td>TO1, TO2, TO3, TO4, TO5, TO6, TO7</td>
<td>T01, T08, T09, T010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs/Development agencies</td>
<td>DA1, DA2, NGO3, NGO4, NGO5, NGO6, NGO7</td>
<td>NG08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local entrepreneurs</td>
<td>LE1, LE2, LE3, LE4</td>
<td>LE1, LE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBTE Co-operatives</td>
<td>Co-op1, Co-op2</td>
<td>Co-op3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local authorities</td>
<td>LA1, LA2</td>
<td>LA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government-based association</td>
<td>GA1, GA2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental tourism department</td>
<td>TG1, TG2, TG3</td>
<td>TG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist suppliers at the destination</td>
<td>TS1, TS2</td>
<td>TS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other stakeholders</td>
<td>OS1, OS2, OS3</td>
<td>OS3, OS4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stakeholder interviews**

In the first stage, CBTE stakeholders were interviewed to ascertain their perspectives about a proposed marketing strategy promoting CBTE business sustainability. Interview participants were recruited using the purposive and snowball sampling methods. Purposive sampling functions to recruit relevant
participants within a limited timeframe (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). In particular, this method was employed to identify the initial 21 participants for interviews. These participants were CBTE stakeholders directly involved in three CBTE projects, that is, Triem Tay Floating Restaurant, Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery, and Minh Tho Homestay. The selection of three CBTEs for the investigation reflected a diversity of CBTE development and CBTE marketing approaches in Vietnam. In particular, Triem Tay Floating Restaurant, which was launched in June 2015, was self-evaluated as an infant enterprise. The business received marketing support from the Triem Tay CBTE co-operative and development agencies to appeal to tour operators and travellers. Thanh Toan Gardening and Cookery, which was established in 2012, achieved relatively substantial growth. The CBTE has gained regular flows of tourists and concurrent partnerships with several tour operators. Minh Tho Homestay was initiated in 2011 with the support of COHED, a Vietnam-based NGO. At the time of the investigation, Minh Tho Homestay was recovered its business with sales and marketing assistance of CBT Travel, a travel agency specialised in CBT. The recovery was recorded after this business was confronted with difficulties in operations in a post-funding period. From the 21 original key participants, nine additional participants involved in CBT development in Vietnam were recruited via a snowball technique until the saturation of data was achieved. Altogether, thirty participants representing CBTE marketing stakeholders in Vietnam were interviewed (see Table 1). The interviews, which were in the form of face-to-face and semi-structured conversations, occurred over four months, from November 2015 to February 2016. The interviewees were asked their opinions on the marketing activities among possible marketing mix components that CBTEs in Vietnam should undertake. They were encouraged to justify their proposal by explaining how these marketing activities could be applicable to the context of Vietnam and could help CBTEs to achieve long-term success.

Workshop participants

Following the collaborative marketing aspects for CBTE business sustainability proposed through the interviews, an interactive workshop was conducted in Triem Tay Village (Quang Nam, Vietnam) on 17 March 2017. The workshop aimed to
discuss the proposed marketing strategy's workability and to reach consensus on the alignment of the strategy with CBTE long-term success. The thirty interview participants were invited to attend the workshop; only eight accepted the invitation. In light of the size of the group discussion and the representativeness of the stakeholder categories, three additional invitations were sent to other interested participants. Apart from the invitees, there were four unexpected participants who were CBTE stakeholders and wished to attend the workshop. Their requests were accepted, considering that the purpose of the workshop was knowledge interaction and sharing. Thus, a total of fifteen participants took part in the workshop (see the right column in Table 1). At the workshop, the proposed marketing strategy for CBTE business sustainability in Vietnam was refined. The proposed strategy was considered its attributes of contextualisation, participation and reconciliation, and its capacity to mitigate imbalanced power relationships among CBTE marketing stakeholders.

**Data analysis**

Content analysis was employed to identify, develop, and refine a marketing strategy for CBTE sustainability. In particular, the data collected from the interviews and workshop were transcribed verbatim and analysed to unravel the components of a marketing strategy for CBTE long-term success. The NVivo software package was used to facilitate the coding process. Indeed, the software functioned to group the respondent quotes into themes and to easily retrieve the data corresponding to a particular theme for analysis and evaluation. Specifically, three themes – market segmentation, product design and development, product communication and promotion – were identified through the data coding process.

**The research findings: proposed marketing strategies for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam**

Through the data analysis, three marketing strategies for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam was proposed and illustrated in the following subsections. These marketing strategies were identified based on the proposals raised through the stakeholder interviews and lately refined through the interactive workshop. The refinement was based on the compromise achieved by
different stakeholder groups, the practicability in the context of Vietnam, the alignment with the principles of sustainable tourism marketing, the possibility of balancing the dual objectives of CBTE business sustainability. As a result, three marketing aspects, that is, market segmentation, product design and development and product promotion, were finalised. These three marketing aspects, according to the research participants, were crucial strategies to materialise a workable pathway for Vietnamese CBTEs to achieve long-term success.

Prioritising selective segmentation marketing techniques to appeal to appropriate travellers

In the realm of CBT development, the identification of potential appropriate travellers is essential because of the power of co-creation between CBTEs and travellers. Local entrepreneurs and CBT products and services are quite vulnerable to external interventions, of which travellers are an important source. Thus, the inclusion of appropriate travellers positively influences the long-term success of CBTEs.

In this respect, the adaptation of selective segmentation in marketing CBTEs is argued to facilitate business sustainability. The selective segmentation approach articulates the nature of CBT initiatives to the characteristics of travellers (Moscardo & Murphy, 2016). The consistency between demand attributes and supply offerings can facilitate the business sustainability of CBTEs. Participant TO9 confirmed, “if we accept all travellers, CBT development will lead to a dead end”.

Specifically, CBTE stakeholders suggested an appropriate segmentation for CBTEs in Vietnam consisting of well-educated, wealthy travellers who are interested in indigenous values and community benefits.

For the Vietnamese market, we should target medium- and high-income travellers [...]. They mostly live in developed countries [...], they are well-educated [...], they respect nature, and they would like to engage in conservations. (TO1)

In addition to international segments, local tourists were also a possible market for CBTEs to sustain their business. CBTEs have relatively more advantages in local
markets than in international segments due to the similar context and culture (Zapata et al., 2011). Particularly, urban citizens and well-educated travellers should be targeted.

There are local markets for CBTEs in Vietnam. Those markets can be Vietnamese students studying overseas and well-educated urban travellers. These segments have good awareness about the principles of CBT, and their behaviour can be adjusted to harmonise with community values. (TO3)

Incorporating the dual objectives of sustainability in product design and development

According to the research participants, four components of product design and development were argued, consisting of balancing indigenous values and market-driven components; setting service quality control as centralised; accounting for the included community fund; aligning with the product frameworks established by CBTE networks.

In general, both indigenous values and market-driven components are essential for a CBT product (Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). In particular, indigenous values are among the community assets that facilitate CBTE initiatives and the foundation of community identity, which is an ultimate goal guiding CBTE development models. Indigenous values including traditions, folklore, handicrafts, costumes, and other natural-cultural-historical resources are types of social capital that encourage the participation of the community in tourism. Thus, indigenous values remain at the core of any marketing approach and regulate CBTE marketing strategies.

We [the CBTE stakeholders] need to bear in mind that a key message in CBTE marketing campaigns is community values, which means indigenous culture, the lifestyle, and traditional crafts. (TS1)

Likewise, market-driven components foster the commercial attractiveness of CBTEs. As a tourism offering, CBT products cannot dismiss the imperativeness of customer-oriented marketing. Proper attention to market research can provide CBTEs with reliable insights to exploit indigenous values for tourism business. The
importance of the tourism market orientation in CBT product development was acknowledged by the CBTE stakeholders, as demonstrated by an outstanding example of homestay accommodations. Homestay is a very popular tourism service offered by local entrepreneurs in less-developed countries. Facilitating homestay accommodation among CBTEs without carefully considering market-related issues is unlikely to lead to long-term success for CBTEs.

*The perception of putting together a room, an air-conditioner, and a mattress to make a homestay unlikely gets that homestay attract tourists.* (TO4)

*We [the funding NGO supporting CBTEs in Nam Giang district, Vietnam] decided not to develop homestays in the village because our source of visitors is from Hoian [a touristic hub], which is just two-and-a-half-hour travel from the community place.* (NGO5)

It is necessary to clarify the level of integration of the two product component categories, i.e., indigenous components and market-driven attributes. While discussing this issue, there were three principles regulating CBT product design. First, satisfying the basic needs of travellers (i.e., safety, security and hygiene) was fundamental, framing the degree of integration of indigenous components and market-driven attributes in CBT product design.

*Stilt houses [a popular kind of shelters for ethnic minorities in the mountainous regions of Vietnam] sharing the same dining and sleeping spaces cannot satisfy the issue of hygiene for visitors.* (TO4)

Second, a flexible combination of indigenous values and traveller demands was encouraged, in which the indigeneity in a CBT product and travellers preferences were reconciled. The following example illustrated this point.

*The Thai people (an ethnic minority group in Northern Vietnam) usually use “bong lau” [a local sedge] to make mattresses. This material might cause allergies to travellers and a mattress made of this material is very hard, which might displease travellers.* (TO5)
Third, the position of indigenous values is at the core layer of product design whereas market-driven components constitute augmented layers. The central position of indigenous values in CBT product design reflects community resilience in tourism engagement and represents an orientation towards the preservation of indigenous values and the representation of community identity in CBT initiatives. Likewise, the market orientation in augmented layers should be designed flexibly to adjust to different market segments. The flexibility of augmented layers is a marketing technique for maximising the trading volume without altering the principles of CBT.

He [CBT Travel's founder who sponsors marketing for Minh Tho homestay] provides us [tour operators] with information about the different services offered by the homestay rather than pre-designed itineraries. The flexibility in service offerings helps us select suitable services for our target customers. (TO3)

Service quality management is positioned at the centre of product design and development to tackle the paradoxical linkage between local entrepreneurs and economic incentives. This paradox is exemplified in this research through the relations between local CBT entrepreneurs and product pricing. As perceived by the participants of this study, there are the issues of price wars among homestays, pricing exploitation by predatory tour operators, and inconsistencies among local entrepreneurs regarding the price of products.

In Lac village [a mountainous village in Vietnam], there are numerous homestays, and homestay owners can easily drop the accommodation fare down to VND 20,000\(^6\), VND 10,000, or even VND 5,000. Accordingly, the service quality decreases, too. Also, the villagers [who are Thai people] sell Chinese souvenirs or those products of unknown origins [that result in an erosion of Thai culture]. (DA1)

When I started the business, I had no idea how much it [gardening service] should be priced. Instead, tour operators gave an offer, and I just accepted

---

\(^6\) US$ 1 is equal to approximately VND 22,000
it. However, later on, I found that with that price, I worked without profits. (LE2)

We made a five-year agreement with the village [Bohoong] about service prices, with periodic reviews. However, the villagers kept requiring extra money for service offerings constantly. (TO10)

Thus, a pricing strategy should be included in a CBTE’s product design and development to satisfy the economic motivations of local communities engaging in the tourism business and to minimize tourism economic misconduct that negatively impacts the sustainable development of local livelihoods. In particular, a relatively high price of CBT products compared to the market price can reduce the commercial appeal of CBTEs, thereby threatening their business’ self-financing. Participant TO7 stated,

Local entrepreneurs usually adopt an indigenous viewpoint in pricing. They value a hand-weaving tapestry based on their working hours on it and its significance in their culture. That viewpoint sometimes generates a relatively higher price for the tapestry than the price range designated by travellers for a souvenir.

Simultaneously, a relatively low price of CBT products compared to the market price can decrease the economic potential that tourism can offer to local communities. A tourist supplier gave an example.

I asked a coffee shop owner in the village [Boohong, Dong Giang, Vietnam] how much he is selling a bottle of beer for and the answer was VND 10,000. In Vietnam, every tourist expects to pay VND 20,000 for a beer [...] so, I advised him that he should charge up to that price, too. (TS2)

Accordingly, service quality control should be at the centre of product design and development. Service quality control makes the abovementioned balanced pricing strategy feasible. Thus, CBTEs should embed in their pricing strategies a commitment to service quality management. Provided that CBT products of a CBTE are of the appropriate quality, the proposed price of its products and services will be reasonable. The study participants illustrated this point as follows:
CBTEs need to convince tour operators that their proposed price is aligned with their guaranteed service quality control. (DA1)

We [tour operators] will accept offers from CBTEs if they can clarify what comes up to that price. (T06)

CBT product design and development should also include a contribution to the community fund. In this study, the participants argued for the necessity of a community fund to maintain the nature of CBTEs, reduce resentment among community members and reflect the business ethics of local entrepreneurs. Additionally, the fund should be approved by the local entrepreneurs, be acknowledged by the local government, and be explained to tour operators and travellers.

We train the locals to mark up 7% of the final price of a handicraft product for the community fund for sustainable development. (NG07)

Because I [the business entrepreneur] am a part of the community [Thanh Toan village], I think I should give back to the community [through a contribution to the community fund]. (LE2)

That community fund can be used for the community’s functional activities (e.g., family visits) and for children’s activities. (T03)

CBT product design and development should also be aligned with the product frameworks established by CBTE networks in consultation with external stakeholders (e.g., tour operators and the government). The participants in this study particularly noted the role of networks in CBTE marketing strategies through the suggestion of having a shared pricing framework for homestays and other CBT product lines within a destination at national or regional levels.

The framework will act as a reference for CBTEs to convey a clear message to tour operators about CBT prices and simultaneously diminish the predatory behaviours of tour operators. (DA1)
A pricing framework helps to avoid price-cutting behaviour of local entrepreneurs. (TO3)

Building a sustainable promotion strategy for CBTEs

With regard to a promotion strategy for CBTEs, two factors were discussed. They included empowering young community members in promoting CBTEs via social media and building a grid of marketing intermediaries.

In terms of communication forms, the role of online marketing was highlighted in the study. Social media plays a crucial role in promoting CBTEs (Mkono, 2016). In light of promotion techniques via social media, the research participants in this study contested that a static website, regardless of its suitability to the limited computer literacy of local communities, was not effective for promoting CBTEs. Instead, communication channels in need were dynamic websites and interactive Facebook. Participant TO6 stated, "Regarding websites and Facebook, it is important that these media be maintained and updated. There needs to be personnel to respond [to visitors’ requests] and to update information. The media should be interactive." Accordingly, the involvement of young people in a community to address the challenge was suggested. Their commitment to managing these social media could facilitate the connections among different generations in CBT development, which is crucial for the long-term success of CBTEs. A participant (DA2) said,

The limited communication capacity of CBTEs regarding social media can be addressed owing to some active members in the community who are young, educated and experienced with these tools. To this end, the gap between CBTEs and the market can be shortened.

Additionally, regardless of the predominance of information exchanges via online social media platforms, the participants in this research still affirmed the significance of marketing intermediaries for CBTE sustainability. In particular, a grid of marketing intermediaries (instead of binary, dyadic, monopolised linkages) was suggested in order to provide alternative conduits connecting CBTEs and
potential travellers, booster the relationships between CBTEs and tour operators, and assist in particularising selective segmentation marketing techniques.

*We [the funding NGO supporting CBTEs in Nam Giang] target group inclusive tours via tour operators because tour operators will help to filter appropriate guests for CBTEs, thereby minimising damaging impacts on the community. (NGO5)*

*Craftlink works as the intermediary of CBT activities, linking local artisans to travellers sourced from WFTO [World Fair Trade Organisation where Craftlink is membered] and NGOs. We have facilitated the relationships between artisan groups and responsible tour operators. We are planning to work with tour operators to attract Vietnamese travellers experiencing handicap values under responsible tourism initiatives. (NGO7)*

*The voices of UNESCO and ILO [two international organisations providing assistance on CBT development in Vietnam] are powerful. Thus, they can invite influential tour operators to come to the table together with local entrepreneurs. (TO1)*

**Discussion**

The principles of the *third way* approach and the *third space* approach are examined in this study. With regard to the *third way* approach, this study argues for the approach’s attributes of contextualisation, participation, empowerment and reconciliation in the context of CBTE marketing. The proposed marketing strategies reflect the contextualisation of CBT development, in which economic and socio-cultural backgrounds and local entrepreneurs’ characteristics are accounted for. For instance, a grid of marketing intermediaries remains relevant for Vietnamese CBTEs because of the intermediaries’ marketing know-how, which can make-up for the marketing shortage among local entrepreneurs and bridge the language barriers between local entrepreneurs and potential travellers (Truong et al., 2014). The inclusion of a community fund in product pricing and using an established CBT pricing framework for products arguably respond to the economic vulnerabilities of local entrepreneurs in Vietnam (Truong et al., 2014), thereby
balancing idealism and pragmatism in proposing CBTE marketing initiatives. The participatory and empowerment attribute of the third way approach is reflected through the proposal of empowering young community members to market CBTEs, which can enhance CBTEs’ business capacity and bolster their long-term success. Likewise, compromises between appropriate customers and segment sizes through selective segmentation marketing and validation of service quality control at the core of product design can indicate the capability of the approach to balance dichotomous CBTE marketing strategies.

Simultaneously, the third space is achieved through deconstructing, to a certain degree, archaeological representations existed in the context of CBTE marketing. The approach can help re-direct the marketing relationships between local entrepreneurs and external stakeholders. For instance, involving multiple stakeholders in the intermediary networks of CBTEs rather than using joint-venture or monopolised partnerships with a sole tour operator can help to break down the dominant-submissive dichotomy prevailed in CBTE-tourism operator linkages. The grid of distribution channels included in the proposed marketing strategy is argued to eliminate the neo-colonial approach in CBT development (Tolkach & King, 2015). Additionally, the intertwining of multiple layers of indigenous values and market-driven attributes in the CBT product design can optimise the social capital of local entrepreneurs and affirm their stakes as tourism providers rather than exploited labour in tourism commodity chains. Finally, the process of initiating, developing, and refining the marketing strategies for CBTE sustainability in Vietnam reflects the collaboration of different knowledge sources and viewpoints among CBTE stakeholders. To this end, the proposed marketing strategies are outcomes of the interactions that occur in the third space.

By identifying marketing strategies for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam, this study argues for the importance of recognising alternative ideological approaches to drive collaborative marketing efforts towards the long-term success of CBTEs. In particular, because it is framed by the third way approach in CBT development and the third space approach in CBT marketing, the proposed marketing strategy adequately addresses the dual objectives of CBTE business sustainability. For instance, the technique of selective segmentation to
identify potential travellers for CBTEs, as illustrated in this study, supports previous studies affirming this segmentation approach to address sustainable objectives (Dolnicar & Leisch, 2008; Moscardo & Murphy, 2016). The position of indigenous values at the core of product development demonstrates the significance of community identity as the ultimate goal for sustainable CBTE development models (Carr et al., 2016). The crucial emphasis on service quality control in product design can help to bridge the gap between CBTE performance and customer satisfaction (Ogucha, Riungu, Kiama, & Mukolwe, 2015). In addition, the inclusion of a community fund in CBT product design can help to sustain the development of CBTEs by sharing the economic benefits with the wider community (Afenyo & Amuquandoh, 2014). Indeed, these marketing aspects are argued to particularise a balanced marketing approach, which better addresses the sustainability objectives of CBTEs in less-developed countries (Ngo et al., 2018).

Also, the process of proposing CBTE marketing strategies in the third space promotes knowledge collaborations, which result in a shrinking of the research-practice gap, re-defines the Self and the Other among involved knowledge holders, encourages social learning outcomes, and empowers marginalised voices, as argued in previous studies (Berkes, 2009; Dredge, Hales, & Jamal, 2013; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). These benefits represent crucial ideological changes that are needed to promote the business sustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries. Accordingly, the main contribution of this research is aimed at the CBT literature by showing that the wicked-natured, multi-paradoxical CBT problem domains can be better addressed by integrating different ideological approaches.

Practical contributions are argued in the study. Indeed, the marketing strategies proposed in this paper are regarded as among the initial attempts to redress the unsustainability of CBTEs in less-developed countries through the lens of sustainable tourism marketing. To this end, this study responds to the need for practical models particularising the philosophies of sustainable tourism marketing into corporate marketing plans (Donohoe, 2012). Within the context of Vietnam, findings from this study provide socially robust, evidence-based reference for NGOs and development agencies attempting to use market-based tools to obtain social missions. The proposed marketing strategies also assist self-funded CBTEs
in their marketing decisions to secure their position in the marketplace in long-term.

**Conclusions**

This paper aims to investigate a marketing strategy oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam. Accordingly, three tailor-made strategies for marketing CBTEs intended to yield long-term success are identified. First, selective segmentation marketing techniques are preferred to appeal to the appropriate travellers. Second, CBT product design and development should embrace indigenous values at the core layers and market-driven attributes at the augmented layers, establish a centralised mechanism for service quality control in the product design, account for the inclusion of a community fund, and align with a pricing framework established by CBTE networks. Third, among the communication and promotion strategies of CBTEs, young community members can promote CBTEs through social media and a grid of marketing intermediaries should be encouraged. These proposed CBTE marketing initiatives are regarded as among the initial attempts to redress the unsustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam. Because CBT research has predominantly focused on critical evaluations without including solutions, the findings of this research are timely and significant with regard to practice.

Through the process of proposing, developing and refining the marketing strategy, the significance of integrating the *third way* approach in CBT development and *third space* approach in CBT marketing to better address the wicked-natured tourism problem domains is exemplified. In particular, because they are underpinned by such an integrated theoretical framework, the proposed marketing strategies provide the capacity to fulfill the dual objectives of CBTE sustainability, encourages collaborative advantages, and balances the power relations between local CBT entrepreneurs and marketing intermediaries.

This study also has some limitations, and therefore, avenues for future research can be suggested. This study adopted the *third way* approach to address the relationships between local entrepreneurs and marketing intermediaries without extending the investigation to host-guest interactions. For instance, studies on
value-based marketing strategies that are designed on the baseline of host-guest encounters for their mutual benefits and learning would be valuable.
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Chapter 7: Discussion

7.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses the research contributions to tourism knowledge. The research aims to depict a collaborative marketing approach oriented towards the business sustainability of CBTEs in less developed countries through resonating the alternative approaches in CBT development, CBT marketing, sustainable tourism and knowledge making. In particular, the thesis argues the echo of the knowledge co-production approach in knowledge making, the third way approach in CBT development, the third space approach in CBT marketing and the collaboration theory to fulfil the research aim. Through attempts to achieve the research aim, which are reflected in the preceding chapters, the study arguably contributes to four tourism knowledge bodies: multi-stakeholder collaborations, CBT, linkages between marketing and sustainable tourism, and tourism knowledge making. Additionally, a collaborative marketing model proposed for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam exemplifies the practical contributions of the research. These research contributions are explained in the following sections.

7.2. CBTE marketing as a complex problem and the collaboration of stakeholders at the organisational level

This study exemplifies the significance of the collaboration theory in addressing complex problems at the organisational level. The collaboration theory has demonstrated its potential to respond to complex problem domains that are beyond the capacity of any individual organisation (Jamal & Getz, 1995; Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Khazaei, Elliot, & Joppe, 2015; Trist, 1983; Wearing, Schweinsberg, & Tower, 2016). In particular, the complex problem, within the scope of this study, is the marketing tasks of a CBTE. The multidimensional, paradoxical nature of CBTE marketing relates to the entanglement of dichotomous objectives of commercial viability and community development during the planning and implementation of entrepreneurship marketing. To this end, the involvement of multiple stakeholders in CBTE marketing is suggested to better promote the attainment of the dual objectives of CBTE business sustainability.
According to the findings of this study, stakeholders included in CBTE collaborative marketing can be private corporations, governments, tourism authorities, NGOs, development agencies, social enterprises, and community-based associations. The involved stakeholders of CBTE marketing are aligned with those engaging in CBT planning and development (Asker et al., 2010; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Jamal & Stronza, 2009; Tolkach & King, 2015). The multi-stakeholder collaboration to address organisation-levelled issues (e.g., CBTE marketing in this study) is plausible because of the not-for-profit nature of CBTEs, their potential to the sustainable development of a destination and the marketing incapability of local entrepreneurs. This study also reveals that the inclusion of stakeholders in a CBTE collaborative marketing network is regulated by two attributes (i.e., power sources and perceived legitimacy), an evaluation of which is subject to contextual factors. For instance, within the context of Vietnam as a communist country, the government and their position in CBTE collaborative marketing are highlighted.

A social entrepreneurship approach is argued to regulate the identification of a facilitator in CBTE collaborative marketing. Substantive research has advocated the position of social enterprises in collaborative terrains (Choi, 2017; Phi, Whitford, & Dredge, 2017; van Wijk, van der Duim, Lamers, & Sumba, 2015; Waligo, Clarke, & Hawkins, 2015). This study contributes to the discussion through the identification of social entrepreneurship to govern a facilitator in CBTE collaborative marketing oriented towards better business sustainability. In particular, this study argues that there should be a transformation of tour operators from successful, profitable corporations to social enterprises to fit the role of a facilitator. The transformation would take the advantages of market-driven expertise and business experience of successful tour operators for a social purpose, that is, marketing CBTEs for business sustainability. To this end, the study sheds light on social enterprise debates in the tourism agenda (von der Weppen & Cochrane, 2012; Wang, Duan, & Yu, 2016). In addition, the present study stresses the crucial characteristics of social entrepreneurs who undertake social innovations through facilitating CBTE collaborative marketing. These characteristics include self-controlling individualism in collective efforts and maintaining transparency in benefit sharing. Such characteristics would increase
the recognition of a facilitator as a local leader from the viewpoints of involved stakeholders and local entrepreneurs (Iorio & Corsale, 2014).

The identification of CBTE co-operatives in CBTE collaborative marketing is illustrated in this study. Indeed, CBTE co-operatives could represent their membered CBTEs because of their authorised identity. Their presence in a CBTE marketing network helps to better distribute tourism benefits within a community. Also, CBTE co-operatives provide a stronger voice than individual CBTEs in attracting tour operators. They can offer the tour operators bundles of services and the sense of community contributions. Thus, the inclusion of CBTE co-operatives in CBTE collaborative marketing and their significance arguably exemplifies the concept of a community institution, which is recently suggested in the studies of CBT for sustainable development (Matarrita-Cascante, Brennan, & Luloff, 2010; Sakata & Prideaux, 2013; Tolkach & King, 2015).

This study argues for the significance of a cognitive consensus among stakeholders in the early stages of a collaboration process. Cognitive consensus has been endorsed as a significant influence on collaborative processes and their outcomes (Jamal & Getz, 1999; Kilduff, Angelmar, & Mehra, 2000). Cognitive consensus, as illustrated in this study, refers to the shared perspectives on indications of CBTE sustainability and pathways for obtaining the objectives of CBTE business sustainability. In particular, this study argues for the principle of a cognitive consensus-building process in collaborative efforts in which the appreciation of involved stakeholders towards other viewpoints and perspectives is prioritised.

7.3. CBTE collaborative marketing approach for business sustainability and the integration of alternative approaches to address CBT challenges

Within the realm of CBT, CBTE collaborative marketing is subject to ideological dilemmas (i.e., post-colonialism versus decolonialism and liberalism versus protectionism). The antipodes of post-colonialism versus decolonialism and neoliberalism versus protectionism are reflected in two contradict pathways (i.e., a commercial viability-driven approach and a community development-driven approach) towards CBTE business sustainability. Under the pathway prioritising
commercial viability as a prerequisite for CBTE sustainability, tour operators are the most crucial stakeholders of CBTEs, and the contractual links between a CBTE and a private partner determine a CBTE marketing network. Accordingly, the commercial viability-driven approach to CBTE sustainability is argued to close to the ends of neocolonialism and neoliberalism. Under the pathway focusing on community well-being and community resilience over economic incentives, the linkages of a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative, and the government stay central in a CBTE marketing network. Appropriately, the community development-driven approach to CBTE sustainability is allocated in proximity to decolonialism and protectionism. These ideological dilemmas also result in paradoxes in the marketisation of CBT products (such as the contradiction of authenticity versus inauthenticity, and modern versus primitive).

This study employed the third way approach to CBT development and the third space approach to CBT marketing to reconcile the contradiction between a commercial viability-driven approach and a community development-driven approach in marketing CBTEs. As part of the outcomes of this endeavour is a balanced marketing approach. In particular, at the middle of the continuum of commercial viability at one end and community development at the other end, there is an approach striking a balance between the dual objectives of CBTE business sustainability. Under this balanced-marketing approach, the presence of a social enterprise to facilitate CBTE marketing collaborations is necessary, and the linkages between a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative, and a social enterprise determine a CBTE marketing network. The approach’s attributes, which were presented in this study, to a certain degree, can address the abovementioned ideological challenges. For instance, being governed as a social enterprise can help a tour operator control their predatory motivation in facilitating CBTE collaborative marketing, thereby minimising threats associated with neocolonialism in CBTE collaborative marketing. The techniques of selective segmentation in marketing strategy empower the local entrepreneurs of a CBTE in relationships with travellers. Concomitantly, the techniques particularise a host-guest interactive platform, where the relationships of local CBTE entrepreneurs and visitors are not sketched along the contradiction of authenticity versus inauthenticity, and modern versus primitive. Instead, their relationships are based on interactions and learning from
each other. A grid of distribution channels included in the proposed marketing strategy helps to avoid the threat of converting local entrepreneurs from suppliers to exploited labours under a neoliberal era.

However, given that, the domain of CBTE marketing is non-detachable from stakeholder collaborations and relationships with travellers, this study advocates CBTE collaborative marketing initiatives oriented towards least-colonialism in CBT development. This trajectory in CBT development is recently argued in CBT studies in less-developed countries (Reggers et al., 2016; Tolkach & King, 2015). Concurrently, provided that CBTE marketing contains in its nature economic-related activities, this study contests a balance between the two-ended neoliberalism and protectionism. Particularly, a neoliberal approach in CBTE marketing remains important. However, the community identity should not be treated as a solely advertising brand. Because doing so will cause contradictions, as seen in the study of !Xaus Lodge (South Africa) (Koot, 2016). Instead, the community identity (which is indeed fluid and hybridised) should be regarded as an input and an ultimate outcome to marketing activities. This is aligned with a current viewpoint positioning the community identity as the critical goal to direct CBTE business sustainability models (Carr et al. 2016).

To this end, this study concurs with the previous attempts striking to reconcile the contradiction between neoliberalism and protectionism in tourism through the third way approach (Burns, 2004; Duffy, 2015; Mitchell et al., 2013; Scheyvens, 2007; Schilcher, 2007). Simultaneously, it advocates for the significance of the third space approach under a post-colonial era (Hollinshead, 1998; Leeming, 2016; Van der Duim et al., 2005; Wearing & Darcy, 2011). Furthermore, the present study’s contribution in the literature of CBT also lies in its integration of alternative approaches (i.e., the third way and the third space approaches) to address ideological challenges associated with paradoxical CBT issues, such as CBTE marketing. Such the integration is argued to tackle the issues at the grassroots level, thereby reinforce the long-term validity of proposed resolutions.
7.4. CBTE collaborative marketing approach for business sustainability and the significance of sustainable tourism marketing in tourism paradoxes

Also in relation to the dichotomy of commercial viability and community development in marketing CBTEs, the utility of marketing as an economic tool arguably cannot lead CBTEs to business sustainability. To this end, the present study adopts the concept of sustainable tourism marketing to address the marketing issues of CBTEs in less-developed countries. The followings are the insights contributed by this study to the realm of sustainable tourism marketing.

This study, together with other initial endeavours, argues for the potential of sustainable tourism marketing in tourism paradoxes (Donohoe, 2012, Wearing et al., 2016). From the findings of this study, a market-driven marketing approach for social goals is advocated to achieve the long-term success of CBTEs in less-developed countries. The market-driven component of the approach is designed to secure the market attractiveness of CBTEs in the marketplace, while the promotion of community identity remains the ultimate goal of marketing endeavours. Therefore, the marketing approach prioritises the balance of the commercial viability and community well-being of CBTEs in marketing planning and implementation. The approach encompasses multiple stakeholders whose diverse perspectives are reconciled. Also, stakeholder perspectives are driven towards the accredited knowledge of CBTE business sustainability by knowledge brokers who are cross-culturally sensitive. Under the approach, the relationships of CBTEs, CBTE co-operatives, and social enterprises originated from successful tour operators remain central in a CBTE marketing network.

Furthermore, through marketing strategies proposed for the long-term success of CBTEs in Vietnam, this study attempts to connect the philosophies of sustainable tourism marketing and marketing initiatives, which is a less attended area to the realm of sustainable tourism marketing (Donohoe, 2012; Font & McCabe, 2017; McDonagh & Prothero, 2014). The marketing strategy contains in its nature contextualised attributes, thus, can be viewed as practical guidance for CBTEs in Vietnam. For instance, through the techniques of selective segmentation, CBTEs in Vietnam should target well-educated, wealthy international travellers who are interested in indigenous values and community benefits and urban-located, well-
educated domestic travellers having good awareness about the principles of CBT. Additionally, pricing strategies (such as a fixed proportion of business revenue for a community fund, and a pricing framework established by CBTE alliances, ideally at the national level) are arguably context-oriented as they respond to the economic vulnerability among local Vietnamese entrepreneurs (Truong et al., 2014). To this end, such pricing strategies help to alleviate economic tensions between a few CBTEs and the wider community (Cohen, 2001). They also resolve the matter of unsatisfied service quality for CBT customers (Ogucha et al., 2015).

Likewise, the inclusion of multiple intermediaries in the distribution network of CBTEs is also regarded applicable to Vietnamese context, where foreign language proficiency is still a hindrance for local CBT entrepreneurs (Truong et al., 2014). In the situations that the concept of sustainable tourism remains rhetoric among practitioners due to its lack of practicability (Ruhanen, 2008), the marketing strategies proposed based on the principles of sustainable tourism marketing, in accordance with practitioners’ viewpoints and contextual backgrounds is regarded as practice-oriented, evidence-based reference for CBTEs to support their marketing decision-making processes.

7.5. Knowledge co-production approach in collaborative works with people and decolonialism in tourism knowledge making

Through three types of benefits, the knowledge co-production approach is argued to underpin collaborative works involving multiple perspectives and research being conducted with people. The knowledge co-production approach arguably helps to reconcile diverse perspectives of different knowledge holders, shorten the research-practice gap and leverage the societal contributions of an academic study. These benefits are illustrated in the following.

The present study argues the potential of the knowledge co-production approach to reconciling diverse perspectives. The knowledge co-production approach has been extensively applied to integrate different ways of knowing for the benefits of collaborative knowledge (Castleden et al., 2012; Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Davidson-Hunt & Michael O’Flaherty, 2007; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016; Holmes et al., 2016; Weiss, Hamann, & Marsh, 2013). This study, through the context of
marketing CBTEs for business sustainability, extends the potential of the knowledge co-production approach to reconciling divergent perspectives. Through the mechanism of the knowledge co-production approach, a greater balance in the dissemination of power to marginalised perspectives is exercised. Within the context of CBT development, those marginalised perspectives often encompass CBT entrepreneurs and local communities rather than experienced external elites. In this study, based on the knowledge co-production approach, divergent perspectives are reconciled, and the cognitive consensus is achieved. Among the outcome of this reconciliation process is a CBTE collaborative marketing framework for business sustainability. This reconciliation is regarded as a trade-off process between theory and practice, between a desirable collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs and an achievable approach.

In addition, the benefits of the knowledge co-production approach are illustrated in this study through the approach’s capability in shortening the research-practice gap. The capacity of the knowledge co-production approach as a resolution to the research-practice gap in tourism studies has repeatedly arisen, but with little evidence (Carr et al., 2016; Dredge & Jamal, 2015; Font & McCabe, 2017). This study is regarded as a response to that call. The capability of the knowledge co-production approach to generate value-based knowledge with socially robust characteristics, which are elucidated in this study, provide evidence contesting the significance of the knowledge co-production approach in reducing the research practice-gap.

In the discussions about the potential of the knowledge co-production approach to bridge the research-practice gap, this study indicates the need for “know-how” among CBTE stakeholders. Accordingly, this study stresses the cross-cultural capability of knowledge brokering institutions. Possessing a cross-cultural capability helps knowledge brokers to reconcile diverse perspectives of different sources of knowledge embedded in different cosmologies. With this insight, the present study contributes to the discussion about the effective strategies of the knowledge co-production process (Gregory, Mair, Merton, & Smith, 2013; Guston, 2001; Head, 2010).
Furthermore, this study argues the capability of the knowledge co-production approach to leverage societal contributions in the outcomes of an academic study. The inclusion of societal contributions to the impact of an academic study has been recently advocated (Australian Research Council, 2017; Dredge et al., 2013). The present study supports this assessment, arguing that a knowledge co-production approach can help an academic study disseminate its research impact beyond academic contributions. That endeavor is particularised through the interactive workshop undertaken in the present study. This workshop is regard as a platform to disseminate the research findings back to CBTE stakeholders and an agora for knowledge dialogues (Becken, Zammit, & Hendrikx, 2015; Castleden et al., 2012; Davidson-Hunt & Michael O'Flaherty, 2007). Previous studies affirm the awareness-raising outcomes of knowledge dialogues under the knowledge co-production approach (Becken et al., 2015; Espeso-Molinero et al., 2016). Additionally, cognitive transformations among embodied researchers towards social justices, a decolonial approach to knowledge generation and ethical responsibility for a better society are also recorded in recent studies as a sort of outcomes from knowledge co-production processes (Berkes, 2009b; Chambers & Buzinde, 2015; Dredge et al., 2013; Pohl et al., 2010). Owing to such potential benefits yielded from the interactive workshop, the societal contributions of this study are claimed.

Due to its capability of reconciling different viewpoints, the knowledge co-production approach is argued to underpin collaborative works involving multiple perspectives. Concomitantly, the knowledge co-production approach can help to shorten the research-practice gap and leverage the societal contributions of an academic study, thereby being plausible to frame the research being conducted with people. Thus, the knowledge co-production approach is argued to frame collaborative works with people and facilitate decolonialism in knowledge generation processes.
7.6. Collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam and implications for other similar contexts

Apart from its contributions to tourism knowledge, this research also indicates certain practical contributions. In particular, this study suggests a collaborative marketing model for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam. Figure 1 illustrates the visual presentation of the model.

This proposed model is argued to benefits NGOs and other development agencies attempting to use market-based tools to obtain social missions. For instance, in the context of Vietnam, International Labour Organisation (ILO) Vietnam has used a holistic value chain approach for poverty alleviation in Quang Nam and Hue provinces (ILO, 2017). Likewise, HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation has employed market-based solutions and a pro-poor value chain approach for the objectives of livelihood development and the increased quality of life in Ha Giang and Cao Bang provinces (ILO, 2017). In another example, SNV initiated REDD+ (Reduced Emissions through Avoided Deforestation and Forest Degradation) initiative, in which a market-based approach was designed and aimed at local communities surrounding the Cat Tien National Park, Lam Dong province to eliminate deforestation and improve conservation (Fletcher, Pforr, & Brueckner, 2016; Huynh, 2014). In these situations, NGOs and development agencies often confront the challenges of effective handover strategies to follow-up short-term funded projects and substantial funding sources to sustain the objective acquisition of a project in long-term (Fletcher et al., 2016; Salazar, 2012). To this end, the present research provides evidence-based reference for those NGOs and development agencies to assist their involvements in less-developed countries. In particular, the present research indicates that multiple stakeholder collaborations, achieved cognitive consensus through the compromise of viewpoints, knowledge brokering institutions, sets of rules co-created by involved stakeholders and aligned with sustainable objectives, and social entrepreneurship, should be considered in market-based efforts to self-sustain conservation and community development projects. Additionally, in those initiatives empowering community assets and encouraging community participation in business, the process of integrating community values to market streams should be conducted in the third space rather
than through either commodification or conservation platforms. Under this sphere, local communities determine their representation through interactions with social actors rather than being museumised by pre-identified images imposed on them. Concomitantly, travel intermediaries engage in marketing relationships with a community with the standpoint of being-opened and co-creation instead of paternalism. Accordingly, NGOs and other development agencies, in those cases, should act as an “expectation” builder and a propagandist to assure the third space for the interactions between local entrepreneurs and marketing stakeholders to be practised.

The government can refer to the findings of this research to inform their policy-decision making processes relating to CBT planning and development. In particular, it is indicated in this research that a top-down approach and government-centralised interventions in CBT planning and development likely results the project failure in long-term. Instead, governmental tourism departments should engage in CBTE projects in the role of an arbitrator and controller, assuring stakeholder relationships and their outcomes are aligned with the objectives of sustainable tourism. In the role of a policymaker, the government should facilitate the establishment of CBTE networks and alliances at national and regional levels to optimise the influence of these institutions on the business sustainability of CBTEs. Also, they should acknowledge the liveable nature of CBT values interpreted in promotional materials of a destination.

CBTEs in Vietnam and other similar contexts can gain insights from the outcomes of this thesis. In term of ideology, a CBTE, like any other tourism enterprises, would generate positive outcomes only if being well-managed and self-financed. Simultaneously, short-term economic incentives achieved at the price of ignoring community well-being impact would result in long-term threats and stagnation in the business life cycle. Additionally, host-guest interactions in an interstitial, culture-hybridised platform for co-creation and learning, which is an alternative approach to the dichotomy of the Self and the Other under skewed relationships, can help to remain a CBTE at the marketplace in long-term. These philosophies should regulate any CBTE marketing strategies. Regarding capacity building, local CBT entrepreneurs should be trained in terms of expectation building, be opened
to the diversity of perspectives, and recognise the need to compromise different viewpoints (and benefits accordingly). Furthermore, they should be aware of the dilemma of individualism versus collectivism and effectively control the dilemma to gain credibility from other stakeholders. This mindset would help to build the capacity of business adaptation for local CBT entrepreneurs. At the aspect of management techniques, it is worthwhile for a CBTE to join CBTE networks for marketing and promotion purposes. These networks would increase the appealing of membered CBTEs by showcasing bundles of services to tour operators, helping to provide a CBTE with a pricing framework and standardised service quality management mechanisms. Additionally, CBTEs should consider the potential of young community members to assist in promoting business via social media and other online marketing tools. Young community members are relatively quick learners in term of information technology literacy, thereby can help CBTEs to booster their viability in online social networks. Concomitantly, including young community members in the management of CBTEs can build up the community resilience and equity, better spread tourism benefits to wider communities and prolong CBT development at a destination.
Selective segmentation marketing techniques are applied. Accordingly, niche segments are targeted to attract sustainable-behaved tourists. In addition, mainstream tourists, who have good awareness about the principles of CBT and have behavior harmonized with local communities, can also be a targeted segment.

In product development, indigenous values are at core layers, and market-driven attributes are at augmented layers. The product layers are aligned with different segments. CBT products are co-designed by both local entrepreneurs and external experts.

Pricing is designed in conjunction with service quality control; A fixed proportion of price structure is for a community fund; A pricing framework established by CBTE alliances is necessary.

A grid of distribution channels, including tour operators, social enterprises, tourism associations, CBTE alliances, NGOs, fair-trade organizations, governments and other tourist suppliers at a destination is favourable. Communication tools, that is, Facebook and websites, need to be livable and interactive; The competence of young community members in social media can be taken to promote CBTEs via Facebook.

Tour operators/Travel agencies/Tourism associations

NGOs/Development agencies/Fair-trading organisations/Social institution

Tourism government/Local authorities

CBTE co-operatives

Other tourist suppliers at a destination

Figure 1: A proposed collaborative marketing approach for the business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam
Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1. Conclusion

This study aims to propose a resolution to marketing challenges faced by CBTEs in less-developed countries through investigating a collaborative marketing approach oriented towards CBTE business sustainability. Given that a majority of CBTEs is collapsed because of marketing-related reasons and that excessive studies are evaluating CBTE success or failure but insufficient attempts are striking for resolutions, this study is regarded as timely and relevant.

Through the findings of this study, it is concluded that a CBTE can overcome their marketing challenges, and use marketing tools to attain the long-term success if the following attributes of a CBTE collaborative marketing approach are presented. The attributes are categorised into three groups, including the inclusion of stakeholders in a CBTE collaborative marketing network, stakeholder relationships, and collaborative marketing strategies. First, multiple stakeholders should be included in a CBTE marketing network. They are tour operators and their professional associations, the government consisting of local authorities and tourism policy-makers, NGOs and development agencies at both international and local levels, and local entrepreneurs and their community alliances. Their inclusion into a CBTE marketing network is based on power sources and perceived legitimacy. Among these stakeholders, the government should be involved in a CBTE marketing collaboration in the role of an arbitrator and controller. Concurrently, social enterprises being transformed from successful tour operators should fit the role of the collaboration facilitator. CBTE co-operatives are identified as a community institution in relations to external stakeholders. In addition, the relations between a CBTE, a CBTE co-operative and a social enterprise are centralised in a CBTE marketing network.

Second, to boost successful and effective relationships among CBTE marketing stakeholders, certain factors should be integrated into a framework of collaboration. At an epistemological level, CBTE stakeholders should appreciate and be open to other viewpoints to provide a favourable environment for
knowledge dialogues to achieve cognitive consensus. The knowledge dialogues can be made productive by the involvement of knowledge brokers who are cross-culturally sensitive. Based on this cognitive foundation, a set of rules, co-created by CBTEs and involved stakeholders, is needed to guide stakeholder interventions in the CBTE marketing network. This set of rules, which details the indicators to achieve CBTE business sustainability, are aligned with the principle of sustainable tourism and are acknowledged by involved stakeholders. Also included in the framework of CBTE marketing collaboration is the transparency of tourism benefits being delivered equitably among involved stakeholders. Furthermore, community leaders (such as social entrepreneurs, and representatives of a CBTE co-operative) should self-control their individualism while being involved in tasks related to collective benefits.

Third, with regards to CBTE collaborative marketing strategies, they are served as a tool to balance the dual objectives of commercial viability and community development, thereby enabling a CBTE to attain long-term success. In particular, the technique of selective segmentation marketing is preferred to attract appropriate segments. These segments are derived from both international, wealthy travellers interested in CBT experiences and domestic, well-educated, well-behaved tourists. In CBT product development, community values are localised at core layers, whereas demand-driven attributes are emphasised at augmented layers of a product. Centralised in the product design and development is the emphasis on service quality management, inclusion of the community fund, and alignment to a pricing framework established by CBTE alliances. Additionally, a grid of distribution channels consisting of both economic and non-economic corporations, government and non-government organisations should be developed to optimise the accessibility of a CBTE as well as alleviate the impact of post-colonialism in CBTE marketing relationships. Finally, among communication tools of CBTEs, social media should be paid further attention. In this regards, young generations within a community can help to leverage the visibility of a CBTE through their engagement in promoting the CBTE via Facebook and websites.

The CBTE collaborative marketing approach, as summarised earlier in this chapter, is developed on the baseline of a quintuple bottom line. First, decolonialism of
knowledge making is promoted. Second, an integration of the third way approach in CBT development and the third space approach in CBT marketing is encouraged. Third, the involvement of multi-stakeholder collaborations rather than dyadic relationships is advocated. Fourth, the principles of sustainable tourism marketing are highlighted. Fifth, a consideration on contextual factors is emphasised.

Through the above-mentioned research findings emphasising the topic of marketing CBTEs for business sustainability, this research yields theoretical and methodological insights. This study advocates the integration of the third way approach and the third space approach that addresses the antitheses of neoliberalism versus protectionism, and neocolonialism versus decolonialism in CBT marketing and development. Additionally, the study argues for the significance of adopting the concept of sustainable tourism marketing to tackle CBTE marketing challenges and propose marketing guidance for CBTEs. Furthermore, the study contends the extension of a multi-collaboration approach at the organisational level. At the methodological level, this study argues the significance of the knowledge co-production approach to underpin collaborative works involving multiple perspectives and research being conducted with people.

8.2. Research limitations

Limitations are recognised in this study. First, this study is delimited to the significance of the concept of sustainable tourism marketing in guiding CBTE collaborative marketing activities towards business sustainability without an attempt to evaluate the proposed marketing strategies as well as interrogating sustainable tourism marketing techniques thoroughly. This study is also delimited to supply-driven marketing endeavours without considering the power of consumerism in facilitating or hindering the efforts of applying the concept of sustainable tourism marketing in marketing CBTEs. Simultaneously, the third space approach is employed in the study to underpin an alternative to interactions between local entrepreneurs and marketing stakeholders. It was not included in this research an attempt to further explore how CBTE offerings can act as a third space where the culture of tourists and local entrepreneurs (and communities) can be hybridised.
Second, the implementation stage of the collaboration process of CBTE stakeholders in marketing CBTEs is ignored in this study. For instance, this research indicated that the outcomes of marketing collaboration processes were much dependent on key individuals, such as local entrepreneurs, social entrepreneurs, and community representatives in CBTE co-operatives. However, this research did not examine issues associated with the involvement of those key individuals in CBTE collaborative marketing, such as the issues relating to individualism versus collectivism. Likewise, this research highlighted the significance of social enterprises in the role of a facilitator of a CBTE marketing network. However, the marketing innovations contributed by social enterprises were out of the discussions in this research. Additionally, this study is contextualised in the context of a communist country and the early stages of a life cycle of CBTEs. Other political economy systems and other stages of a CBTE life cycle can differentiate the research outcomes.

Third, the discussion on the knowledge co-production approach in this study is remained only at the epistemological level without addressing issues linked with the approach’s application in methodological practices. Among the critical issues was the cross-cultural capability of this approach in collaborative research to bring co-researchers from different cultural backgrounds to co-author pieces of knowledge disseminated in conventional platforms (such as English-written publications). Additionally, the findings of this research revealed that research impacts beyond its academic contributions are prioritised under the knowledge co-production approach. However, the knowledge mobility in different communication platforms of an academic study and its contributions to the long-term productivity of the study was still unknown. Also, a post-learning evaluation, which is an important aspect of assessing the significance of the knowledge co-production as a research methodological approach, was not addressed in this study.

8.3. Implications for future research

Indicated by the limitations and delimitations of this research, certain implications for future research are suggested. Under the terrain of CBTEs, marketing, and
business sustainability, there are three avenues that future research can be grounded from the present study. First, a study focusing on a sustainable marketing model for CBTEs is valuable. Under this model, efforts to evaluate the sustainable marketing techniques of CBTEs are emphasised. Also useful are customer-driven studies on the topic of marketing CBTEs for business sustainability. Third, a study on host-guest encounters played in the *third space* approach under the context of CBTEs is also valuable.

Furthermore, empirical, ethnographic, or longitudinal studies are necessary to assess the issues linked with the implementation stage of stakeholder collaborations in marketing CBTEs. Additionally, comparative research examining the influence of different political economy systems to CBTE collaborative marketing endeavours is useful. Also, a study on CBTE collaborative marketing strategies over different stages of a CBTE life cycle is of value. Another valuable study is about issues associated with individualism versus collectivism in CBTE collaborative marketing. Such issues can encompass the characteristics of community leaders in successful CBTE co-efforts, and the viewpoints of community members to collective benefits. Likewise, an investigation on the social innovations of social enterprises in marketing CBTE is regarded relevant to develop a CBTE model.

Lastly, it is worthwhile to devote further attempts to clarify the significance of the knowledge co-production approach in tourism methodology. For instance, future research can interrogate co-management and co-creation initiatives in the CBTE marketing domain framed by the knowledge co-production approach. Additionally, it is valuable to evaluate knowledge mobility through different communication platforms (including peer-reviewed journals, trading journals and other non-academic tools) to interrogate the research impact generated by a knowledge co-production study. Furthermore, cultural factors inevitably inhibit the potential of a knowledge co-production study. An investigation on the topic of culture and knowledge co-production is needed to leverage the potential of the knowledge co-production approach in cross-cultural research enquiries. Likewise, a study about a post-learning stage is also possible to critically evaluate the significance of the knowledge co-production approach towards better social changes.
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Within the scope of this research, CBTE is defined as a micro and small scale, rural located venture where the community participate in business in terms of an owner, manager and main beneficiary. In order for this kind of venture to sustain in long-term development, dual objectives of commercial viability and community's capacity building are taken into considerations.

**Rationale for your participation**

You are invited to participate in this research because of you involvement (either
directly or indirectly) in marketing CBTEs in Vietnam. The identification of participants is based on literature review regarding stakeholders’ intervention in marketing activities of CBTEs and on recommendations of other participants who have accepted to participate in this research.

**Procedure of participation**

If you agree to participate in this study, you will attend a one-hour interview taken place at a time and a public location convenient to you. Our conversation will be based on the questions posed by me to address your views and opinions regarding the research’s topic.

In order to obtain accurate information, the interview will be recorded. If required by you, a copy of the transcription of the interview can be sent to you (via the email you provide) for amendment and correction and will be returned within two months of this interview.

Before starting the interview, you will receive the Consent Form. Please read carefully before signing the form and return one copy to me while keeping one copy for yourself.

Please note that your participation in this study is absolutely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from the study at any time for any reason, and without any consequences.

As a compensation for your participation in this interview, you will receive a shopping voucher of VND150,000 (equivalent to AU$10).

**Risks**

There are no physical, psychological, social, legal or economic risks associated with your participation in this study.

**Privacy and confidentiality**

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/ or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. It is my responsibility to keep all of your related information in a secured location in my office (for hard copy data) and in a password-protected folder (for digital data). After submitting my thesis, the data will be retained by Griffith University and will be destroyed five years from completion of the research.

**Ethical approval**

This research is conducted in compliance with all requirements of Vietnamese laws and policies and has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Griffith University. The approval reference number is GU/2015/795. If you have any concerns regarding the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact (in English only) the Manager, Research Ethics of Griffith University on telephone number: (+61)
3735 4375 or via email address: research-ethics@griffith.edu.au. In case you prefer a communication in Vietnamese rather than English, you can contact me on phone number (+61) 426954150 (Australian number) or (+84) 905476866 (Vietnamese number) or email address: tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au. All information will be treated as soon as possible and in confidence.

If you need further information on this study, or have any other issues relating to your participation, please feel free to contact me or my supervisors at any time.

Your participation is this research is highly appreciated. Thus, I hope you are able to confirm your participation.

Thank you very much,

Best regards,

Tra My Thi Ngo
PhD Candidate,
Griffith University, Nathan campus,
Queensland, Australia, 4111.
Appendix 3: Information sheet for respondents (in Vietnamese)

THÔNG TIN VỀ ĐỀ TÀI NGHIÊN CỨU

Cảm ơn ông/bà đã quan tâm đến đề tài nghiên cứu luôn ám ảnh của tôi. Dưới đây là toàn bộ thông tin về đề tài, tác giả nghiên cứu và sự tham gia của ông/bà.

Tên đề tài: Mô hình marketing hợp tác cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ ở Việt Nam

Thống tin nghiên cứu sinh

Bà: Ngô Thị Trà My
Trưởng Đại học Griffith
tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au
(+61) 426954150

Giáo sư hướng dẫn

Đề tài này được hướng dẫn bởi:

PGS.TS Gui Lohmann
Giảng viên hướng dẫn (chính)
Trưởng Đại học Griffith
g.lohmann@griffith.edu.au
(+61) 7 3735 4059

TS Robert Hales
Giảng viên hướng dẫn
Trưởng Đại học Griffith
r.hales@griffith.edu.au
(+61) 7 5552 7350

Mục đích nghiên cứu

Đề tài này được thực hiện theo khuôn khổ yêu cầu dành cho học vị Tiến sĩ của trường Đại học Griffith, Úc. Mục đích nghiên cứu của đề tài là nhằm đề xuất mô hình marketing hợp tác cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch dựa vào cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ ở Việt Nam, giúp các doanh nghiệp này vượt qua các thách thức marketing và phát triển bền vững.

Trong phạm vi nghiên cứu của đề tài, doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng được hiểu là các doanh nghiệp vừa và nhỏ đặt tại địa phương nơi mà cộng đồng tham gia vào hoạt động kinh doanh với tư cách chủ doanh nghiệp, nhà quản lý và đối tượng hưởng lợi chủ yếu. Để các doanh nghiệp này có thể phát triển bền vững, cả hai mục tiêu tăng trưởng du lịch và cải thiện năng lực quản lý của cộng đồng địa phương một cách tương ứng cần phải được quan tâm.

Căn cứ lựa chọn ông/bà tham gia vào nghiên cứu

Ông/bà được mời tham gia vào nghiên cứu này vì ông/bà có liên quan trực tiếp hoặc gián tiếp đến công tác marketing các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ ở
Việt Nam. Việc xác định đối tượng tham gia vào dự án nghiên cứu cần chú vào hai chỉ tiêu chính: những cân cứ khoa học về sự can thiệp của các nhóm đối tác trong hoạt động marketing của các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ, và sự giới thiệu của các thành viên đã đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu.

Quy trình tham gia
Nếu ông/bà đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu này, ông/bà sẽ tham gia một cuộc phỏng vấn khoảng 1h đồng hồ tại cơ quan ông/bà hoặc địa điểm công cộng và thời gian thuận tiện cho ông/bà. Cuộc phỏng vấn sẽ được thực hiện bởi cá nhân tôi xoay quanh các câu hỏi về ý kiến và quan điểm cá nhân của ông/bà liên quan đến đề tài nghiên cứu.

Để đảm bảo tính chính xác của thông tin, cuộc phỏng vấn sẽ được ghi âm. Nếu ông/bà yêu cầu, một bản sao nội dung trả lời phỏng vấn mà ông/bà đã tham gia sẽ được gửi cho ông/bà (thông qua email ông/bà cung cấp) để chính sửa nội dung nếu cần. Bản sao này sẽ được giữ lại trong vòng 02 tháng kể từ cuộc phỏng vấn này.

Trước khi bắt đầu cuộc phỏng vấn, ông/bà sẽ được tỏ cung cấp phiếu Đóng ý tham gia nghiên cứu. Ông/bà vui lòng đọc kỹ nội dung của mẫu phiếu, đặt câu hỏi giải thích nếu cần trước khi vào phiếu và gửi lại cho tôi một bản, ông/bà giữ lại một bản.

Vui lòng lưu ý rằng sự tham gia của ông/bà vào nghiên cứu này là hoàn toàn tự nguyện. Ông/bà có thể yêu cầu dừng tham gia hoặc rút ra khỏi dự án nghiên cứu bất cứ khi nào, với bất cứ lý do gì mà không bị bát cư hậu quả nào.

Nếu một phần cho sự bù đắp dành cho ông/bà, một phiếu mua hàng trị giá 150.000 đồng (tương đương 10 đô la Úc) sẽ được trao cho ông/bà sau khi cuộc phỏng vấn kết thúc.

Rủi ro
Không có bất kỳ rủi ro nào về vật chất, tình thần, xã hội, luật pháp hay kinh tế liên quan đến sự tham gia của ông/bà vào nghiên cứu này. Cuộc phỏng vấn được thực hiện một cách cởi mở, tạo sự thoải mái cho người tham gia.

Chính sách riêng tư và quyền bảo mật
Đề tài này được thực hiện có liên quan đến việc thu thập, tiếp cận và sử dụng thông tin cá nhân của ông/bà. Những thông tin thu thập được sẽ được đảm bảo tính riêng tư và sẽ không được tiết lộ cho bên thứ 3 mà không có sự đồng ý của ông/bà. Một bản sao không định danh của dữ liệu thu thập có thể sẽ được sử dụng cho những mục đích nghiên cứu khác. Tuy nhiên, dữ liệu này sẽ không được phân chia hoặc sử dụng để lưu trữ trong vòng 2 năm.

Sự chấp thuận đạo đức nghiên cứu
Đề tài nghiên cứu này được thực hiện với sự tuân thủ theo chính sách pháp luật của Việt Nam, nước sở tại và được thông qua bởi Hội đồng đạo đức trong các nghiên cứu liên quan đến người của trường Đại học Griffith. Sở hồ sơ phê duyệt là GU/2015/795. Nếu ông/bà có bất kỳ thắc mắc nào về đạo đức nghiên cứu của đề tài này, ông/bà có thể liên lạc (bằng tiếng Anh) với Giám đốc phụ trách đạo đức nghiên cứu của trường Đại học Griffith theo số điện thoại (+61) 3735 4375 hoặc thư điện tử research-ethics@griffith.edu.au. Trong trường hợp ông/bà muốn tiếp bằng tiếng Việt, ông/bà có thể liên hệ tôi theo số điện thoại ở Úc (+61)426954150 hoặc số
N. Tramy - Collaborative marketing for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises: a knowledge co-production approach

dién thoại ở Việt Nam (+84) [CẬP NHẬT SAU] hoặc thư điện tử tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au. Tất cả những vấn đề ông/bà nếu ra sẽ được giải quyết sớm nhất có thể trên cơ sở đảm bảo quyền riêng tư.

Nếu ông/bà muốn có thêm thông tin về đề tài nghiên cứu này, hoặc chi tiết về sự tham gia của ông/bà, xin vui lòng liên hệ tôi hoặc các giáo sư hướng dẫn của tôi theo thông tin liên lạc phía trên vào bất cứ lúc nào.

Sự tham gia của ông/bà ảnh hưởng quan trọng đến thành công của đề tài nghiên cứu. Vì vậy, tôi rất mong sớm nhận được sự xác nhận đồng ý tham gia của ông/bà.

Tôi xin chân thành cảm ơn;
Trân trọng!

Ngô Thị Trà My
Nghiên cứu sinh, trường Đại học Griffith
Nathan, bang Queensland, Úc, 4111.
Appendix 4: Consent Form (in English)

Collaborative marketing for community-based tourism enterprises through knowledge co-production: case studies in Vietnam

CONSENT FORM

Research team:

Tra My Thi Ngo  
PhD student  
School of Natural Sciences  
Griffith Institute for Tourism  
Griffith University  
tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au  
(+61) 426954150

A/Prof Gui Lohmann  
Principal supervisor  
Griffith University  
g.lohmann@griffith.edu.au  
(+61) 7 3735 4059

Dr Robert Hales  
Associate supervisor  
Griffith University  
r.hales@griffith.edu.au  
(+61) 7 5552 7350

My consent:  
By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet provided to me by the researcher and in particular have noted that:

• I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary and I understand that I can withdraw my participation at any time, and without any consequences;

• I understand that my involvement in this research will include an interview of about one hour at a time and a public location convenient to me;

• I agree to allow the interview to be audio recorded in order to secure the accuracy of information;

• I understand that any publications or reporting of the results from this research that have information provided by me will not be associated with my name, my position, and my organization and a pseudonym of my name will be used instead;
• I understand that I can request the researcher to provide me with a copy of the transcript of the interview recorded for my amendment and that I will return this copy within two months of the interview;

• This research is conducted in compliance with all requirements of Vietnamese laws and policies and has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Griffith University. The approval reference number is GU/2015/795. I understand that I can contact (in English only) the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on (+61) 7 3735 4375 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project. In case I prefer a communication in Vietnamese rather than English, I can contact Tramy Thi Ngo, PhD candidate on phone number (+61) 426954150 (Australian number) or (+84) [UPDATE LATER] (Vietnamese number) or email address: tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au.

My signature below signifies my agreement to participate in the research.

Name:.........................................................................................................
Signature:........................................................................Date:......................
Mô hình marketing hợp tác cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ ở Việt Nam

PHIẾU ĐỒNG Ý THAM GIA NGHIÊN CỨU

Nhóm nghiên cứu:

Ngô Thị Trà My
Nghiên cứu sinh, Đại học Griffith, Úc
tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au
(+61) 426954150

PGS.TS Gui Lohmann
Giảng viên hướng dẫn Đại học Griffith, Úc
g.lohmann@griffith.edu.au
(+61) 7 3735 4059

TS Robert Hales
Giảng viên hướng dẫn Đại học Griffith, Úc
r.hales@griffith.edu.au
(+61) 7 5552 7350

Sau khi đọc và tìm hiểu kỹ các nội dung trong Phiếu thông tin của đề tài nghiên cứu trên; tôi đồng ý tham gia vào nghiên cứu, chi tiết như sau:

• Tôi hiểu rằng sự tham gia của tôi vào nghiên cứu này là hoàn toàn tự nguyện, và tôi có quyền dừng không tham gia nghiên cứu hoặc rút ra khỏi nghiên cứu ở bất kỳ thời điểm nào của nghiên cứu mà không chịu bất cứ hậu quả nào;

• Tôi sẽ tham gia một cuộc phỏng vấn trực tiếp kéo dài khoảng 1h đồng hồ tại cơ quan hoặc địa điểm công cộng cùng thời gian do tôi đề xuất.

• Tôi đồng ý để cuộc phỏng vấn được ghi âm để đảm bảo tính chính xác của thông tin;

• Tôi hiểu rằng tất cả tài liệu hoặc âm phẩm được công bố từ đề tài nghiên cứu này có liên quan đến thông tin tôi cung cấp sẽ không được gán với tên, chức danh và cơ quan tôi đang công tác. Thay vào đó, bütün sẽ được sử dụng;

• Tôi hiểu rằng tôi có thể yêu cầu nhóm nghiên cứu cung cấp cho tôi bản sao của quá trình phỏng vấn để tôi có thể điều chỉnh câu trả lời của mình. Và tôi sẽ gửi lại bản sao này cho nhóm nghiên cứu trong vòng 02 tháng kể từ khi kết thúc cuộc phỏng vấn.
• Đề tài này được thực hiện với sự tuân thủ theo chính sách pháp luật của Việt Nam, nước sở tại và được thông qua bởi Hội đồng đạo đức trong các nghiên cứu liên quan đến con người của trường Đại học Griffith. Sổ hồ sơ phê duyệt là GU/2015/795. Tôi hiểu rằng tôi có thể liên lạc Giám đốc phụ trách đạo đức nghiên cứu của trường Đại học Griffith theo số điện thoại (+61) 7 3735 4375 hoặc thư điện tử research-ethics@griffith.edu.au nếu tôi có bất kỳ thắc mắc nào liên quan đến đạo đức nghiên cứu của đề tài này. Trong trường hợp tôi muốn giao tiếp bằng tiếng Việt, tôi có thể liên hệ bà Ngô Thị Trà My theo số điện thoại ở Úc (+61)426954150 hoặc số điện thoại ở Việt Nam (+84) [CẤP NHẬT SAU] hoặc thư điện tử tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au.

Chữ ký bên dưới xác nhận sự đồng ý tham gia của tôi trong nghiên cứu này.
Tên:...................................................................................................................
Chữ ký:..........................................................  Ngày:......................................
Appendix 6: Interview questions [1] (in English)

1. How do you think about a collaborative approach in marketing CBTEs to help these businesses to attain long-term success?
2. In your opinion, who should be involved in the CBTEs’ marketing collaboration?
3. How would you expect their marketing supports for the CBTEs?
4. Which stakeholder should facilitate the marketing collaboration of these stakeholders?
5. In your opinion, what is the best way in which stakeholders should collaborate with each other and with local entrepreneurs and wider communities in terms of marketing?
6. How CBTEs, in collaborating with external stakeholders, can better develop CBT products and services?
7. In which ways the external stakeholders can support the CBTEs in pricing CBT products and services?
8. How external stakeholders can better assist the CBTEs in distributing their products and services?
9. How external stakeholders can better help CBTEs in publication and promotion?

[1] As the technique of semi-structure interviewing was used in this study, the above-mentioned interview questions were used flexibly in interviews.
Appendix 7: Interview questions (in Vietnamese)

1. Theo anh/chị, marketing theo mô hình liên kết, hợp tác có thể đóng góp như thế nào cho sự phát triển bền vững cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng?

2. Những ai/tớ chức/don vị nào nên có mặt trong mô hình marketing hợp tác này của các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng?

3. Anh/chị nghĩ vị trí của mình và của các đối tác khác mà anh/chị vừa đề xuất trong mô hình marketing hợp tác này là gì và vai trò ra sao?

4. Ai/tớ chức nào nên là người dùng ra kết nối và vận động sự hợp tác giữa các đối tác và người dân địa phương để tham gia vào mô hình makreting hợp tác cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng? Thông qua cách thức nào?

5. Theo anh/chị, ở khả cảnh marketing, những yếu tố nào quyết định sự hợp tác thành công giữa người dân địa phương và các đối tác bến ngoài và giữa các đối tác với nhau?


7. Mô hình marketing hợp tác có thể giúp các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng như thế nào trong công tác định giá sản phẩm dịch vụ? Don vị của anh/chị có thể giúp người dân định giá sản phẩm như thế nào?

8. Bằng cách thức nào, các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng có thể khai thác mô hình marketing hợp tác để xây dựng và phát triển các kênh phân phối thông tin về sản phẩm du lịch cộng đồng? Các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng có thể có được những kênh phân phối nào từ mô hình marketing hợp tác này?

9. Các đối tác marketing trong mô hình này có thể giúp doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ trong công tác quảng bá tiếp thị sản phẩm như thế nào? Cú thể đó với don vị của anh/chị và

10. Ngoài những trao đổi ở trên, anh/chị còn muốn chia sẻ thêm ý kiến gì về mô hình marketing hợp tác cho các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ cũng như những yếu tố giúp mô hình này trở nên có hiệu quả?
Appendix 8: Invitation email sent to workshop participants (in English)

Sub: Invitation to participate in a workshop “Co-generating a collaborative marketing paradigm for business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam”

Dear Mr/Ms....,

I am Tramy Ngo, a PhD candidate of Griffith University, Australia. I am doing a research named “Collaborative marketing for community based tourism enterprises through knowledge co-production: case studies from Vietnam” as per the requirements of PhD degree under Griffith University policies.

I am writing to invite you to participate in a workshop, which is a part of data collection for the research. Information about the workshop is as follow:

Workshop theme: “Co-generating a collaborative marketing paradigm for business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam”.
Date: 17/3/2017
Venue: The community hall, Triem Tay village, Quang Nam, Viet Nam.
Objectives:
- Sharing different perspectives regarding marketing collaboration for business sustainability of CBTEs derived from “insiders” through (1) interview findings which were undertaken during the period of November 2014 and January 2015, and (2) current academic discourse about the topic;
- Interacting and co-producing a collaborative marketing paradigm for business sustainability of CBTEs in Vietnam;
- Broadening knowledge about the topic among participants.

Program: (attached file)

In our best efforts to support your participation within budget limits of a PhD study, following incentives are offered:
- 01 night accommodation in a three star hotel in Hoian (twin share, breakfast included) (*)
- Shuttle and boat to transfer from the hotel to the venue and return (**) 
- Lunch offered by Triem Tay community group of cuisine on a set menu basis. (***) 

In case you do not need accommodation (*) and lunch (***) these incentives would be transferred into cash which is equivalent to 350,000VND for (*) and 100,000VND for (**). The incentive (**) is not transferable into cash.

Your participation determines the workshop’s success. So, I look forward to seeing you in the workshop.
For our convenient arrangement of the workshop, please reply this email before 24/2/2017.
If you seek more information or have any doubt about the research and/or the workshop, please feel free to contact me via email tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au or phone number (+61) 426954150.

Thanking you,
Best regards,
Tra My Thi Ngo
PhD candidate,
Griffith University, Australia.
Appendix 9: Invitation email sent to workshop participants (in Vietnamese)

Sub: Thư mời tham gia workshop “Marketing hợp tác cho các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng ở Việt Nam - Sự cung hưởng tri thức”

Tôi là Trà My, hiện đang là nghiên cứu sinh tại trường đại học Griffith, Úc. Nhận dip năm mới Định Đậu, cho phép tôi được gửi lời chúc sức khỏe và thành đạt đến anh/chị.

Theo yêu cầu của chương trình học tập, tôi đang thực hiện một đề tài nghiên cứu có tên “Marketing hợp tác cho sự phát triển bền vững của các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng”. Mục đích nghiên cứu là nhằm để xuất một hình mẫu marketing hợp tác giúp các doanh nghiệp du lịch cộng đồng vừa và nhỏ ở Việt Nam có thể vượt qua các thách thức marketing, và phát triển bền vững.

Tôi gửi thư này với hi vọng có thể mời anh/chị tham gia buổi workshop được thực hiện với mục đích thư pháp để hiểu cho để tài nghiên cứu sinh của tôi. Thông tin chi tiết về buổi workshop như sau:

Workshop: “Marketing hợp tác cho các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng ở Việt Nam - Sự cung hưởng tri thức”

Thời gian: 7.30am-12.30pm, ngày 17/3/2017.
Địa điểm: Nhà sinh hoạt cộng đồng thôn Triển Tây, Quảng Nam, Việt Nam.

Thành phần:
- Đại diện các nhóm đối tác tham gia vào nỗ lực marketing cho các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng, bao gồm công ty lưu hành, chính quyền địa phương, cơ quan quản lý du lịch, NGO và các tổ chức phát triển, hiệp hội, ...
- Đại diện người dân địa phương tham gia du lịch cộng đồng, ban quản lý các hợp tác xã du lịch cộng đồng;
- Nhóm tác giả đề tài nghiên cứu.

Mục đích:
- Chia sẻ quan điểm về marketing hợp tác cho các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng qua các góc nhìn của người trong cuộc thông qua: (1) kết quả phản hồi được thực hiện từ tháng 11 năm 2014 đến tháng 1 năm 2015 và (2) các nghiên cứu học thuật hiện tại liên quan đến chủ đề;
- Trao đổi về một hình mẫu marketing hợp tác hướng đến sự phát triển bền vững cho các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng ở Việt Nam;
- Mở rộng kiến thức về chủ đề thảo luận cho các bên tham gia workshop.

Chương trình dự kiến (được chỉnh kèm thư mời)

Với nỗ lực tạo điều kiện cho người tham gia workshop trong khuôn khổ cho phép của một đề tài nghiên cứu sinh, anh/chị đồng ý tham gia workshop sẽ nhận được các hỗ trợ sau:
- 01 đêm nghỉ tại khách sạn tiêu chuẩn 3 sao ở Hội An (ghép 2 người/phòng, bao gồm ăn sáng) (*)
- Thuyết d展 dưới khách sạn đến đêm tham gia workshop và ngược lại (**)
- 01 bữa trưa theo thực đơn do tổ âm thực của làng du lịch cộng đồng Triển Tây cung cấp(***)

N. Tramy - Collaborative marketing for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises: a knowledge co-production approach
N. Tramy - Collaborative marketing for the business sustainability of community-based tourism enterprises: a knowledge co-production approach

Nếu anh/chị không có nhu cầu sử dụng các hỗ trợ (*) và (**), xin anh/chị vui lòng thông báo trong thư trả lời tham gia workshop. Khoản hỗ trợ sẽ được quy đổi thành tiền mặt, trong trường hợp 350,000VND cho mục (*) và 100,000VND cho mục (**). Riêng mục (**) không có giá trị quy đổi thành tiền mặt.

Vi những hỗ trợ cho người tham gia workshop không bao gồm chi phí vận chuyển, nên tôi có thể cung cấp một thư mời chính thức từ giáo sư hướng dẫn từ trường Griffith để giúp người tham gia có thể xin một phần kinh phí vận chuyển từ cơ quan đang công tác. Nếu anh/chị yêu cầu thư mời này (thư bằng tiếng Anh), anh/chị có thể thông báo trong thư trả lời giúp tôi, tôi sẽ gửi file đính kèm.

Mọi thông tin có liên quan, xin vui lòng liên hệ địa chỉ tramy.ngo@griffithuni.edu.au, hoặc số điện thoại (+61) 426954150.
Tôi xin chân thành cảm ơn sự quan tâm và giúp đỡ của anh/chị,
Rất mong nhận được hồi âm của anh/chị,
Trà My
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Appendix 10: Infographic sent to workshop participants (in Vietnamese)
Appendix 11: Open-ended survey (in English)

SURVEY

Thank you for your time participating the workshop.

In your opinion, how the workshop satisfied your interest about collaborative marketing approach in the business sustainability of CBTEs? Please illustrate by few examples.

Would you like to add more ideas about the workshop discussions, which you could not had opportunities to share during the workshop?

Thank you for your feedback!
Appendix 12: Open-ended survey (in Vietnamese)

PHIẾU KHẢO SÁT

Cảm ơn anh/chị đã dành thời gian tham gia workshop.

Theo ý kiến cá nhân, buổi workshop có giúp ích cho sự quan tâm của anh/chị đối với chủ đề marketing hợp tác cho sự phát triển bền vững của các mô hình kinh tế du lịch cộng đồng? Xin vui lòng cho một vài ví dụ minh họa.

Anh/chị có muốn chia sẻ thêm điều gì về chủ đề thảo luận, mà trong buổi workshop chưa có cơ hội trao đổi?

Xin trân trọng cảm ơn ý kiến phản hồi của anh/chị!